

The Reformed Church Review

Volume 4

JANUARY, 1925

Number 1

I

IS THERE PROGRESS?

GEORGE W. RICHARDS

That men have had the idea of progress cannot be gainsaid in the light of the history of human thought. It may be questioned, however, whether there is a fact corresponding to the idea or whether the idea is simply a fiction of the brain without basis in fact. There are those who boldly and coldly speak of the idea of progress as a "superstition" to which men have made both science and Scripture subservient. It may be an antinomy which can as readily be disproved as proved, all depending upon the position into which the facts fall in the kaleidoscope into which one fondly gazes.

It is reasonably certain that neither motion nor change is necessarily progress. Motion may be circular like the squirrel's in a revolving cage; it may be upward and downward like the seesaw's on the playground; it may be forward and backward like jazz dancing, on which, however, I do not claim to speak with the authority of experience. Change may, also, be as frequently for the worse as for the better, or from the good to the bad as often as from the bad to the good. What, therefore, appears to be evolution may be dissolution. Dr. Jevons says: "Though evolution is universal, progress is exceptional."

In short one may assume, though he may run counter to an axiomatic presupposition of the modern man, that the

fact of progress is at least debatable, that a person's sanity ought not to be impeached if he ventures to discuss the things that may be said for and against progress. For there were times, and the time still is, when the idea of progress was not at all looked upon with favor by certain men of light and leading. Among them were ancients like Crates and Antisthenes and moderns like Rousseau, Walt Whitman, Thoreau, and Ruskin. Indeed, great systems of philosophical and theological thought do not take the least cognisance of the view that things and persons, the cosmos and humanity, are advancing from the lower to the higher, from the imperfect to the perfect.

The world can scarcely be said to be immobile or static; it is, to say the least, active and changing. It may be in a state of decadence, or of cyclic recurrence, integrating and disintegrating, or of progressive development. Each of these theories has been held at one time or another and has been incorporated as part of the religion and philosophy of large portions of mankind.

I

It may help us to get into the clear if we consider briefly the history of the idea, before we discuss the evidences for the fact, of progress.

The book of Genesis, for example, has been made to teach evolution, though such a theory was wholly foreign to the mind of the author. Its doctrine of the Fall lends itself far more to the theory of dissolution and decadence than of progress. Men, created in the image of God, through their own volition regressed rather than progressed. They came under the power of sin and ever since they have been under the penalty of burdensome toil and fatal disease. Only when supernatural aid intervened and men put faith in the ultimate fulfilment of divine promises, did they look up in hope and await with patience a better age to come into a ruined world.

There was always a melancholy strain, the refrain of the

still sad music of humanity, in the life of the Greeks, "at once the most hopeful and the most despairing of people." So graphically did Hesiod depict his theory of retrogression, that it has been etched upon the memory of man. Men have never ceased to speak of the ages of Gold, Silver, Bronze and Iron, representing the retrograding movement of humanity. His division of time must correspond to something in human experience, else its nomenclature would have been forgotten long ago. Horace put it into verse when he wrote: "What a race the golden sires have left—worse than their fathers, and your offspring will be baser still."

All the oriental peoples have the backward look, are under the grip of the dead hand, and seek to conform their lives slavishly to the wisdom and virtue of the past rather than to strive freely and courageously for the attainment of the wisdom and virtue of the future. Yet there is another side to life both in the East and the West, which constrains men to believe that "the best is yet to be."

The theory of cyclic recurrence is taught in the Hindu philosophy of the Vedanta, which Deussen pronounces equal in rank to the philosophy of Plato and Kant and "one of the most valuable products of the genius of man in his researches of the eternal truth." Sankara, its classic exponent, denies that the world was created at a certain time; he assumes that it passes through cycles of progress and regress, a kind of alternating expansion and contraction of the pulse of the universe. It emerges from the infinite and is again submerged in the infinite—a continuous process of degradation. The only reason assigned for the ceaseless projection and absorption is moral necessity. Plato, likewise, speaks of a world-cycle of 36,000 solar years during which time the Creator guides its course. Then in a similar period it disintegrates and a new cycle follows the old. In his "Laws," he refers with deep pathos to the numberless nations and states—ten thousand times ten thousand—that have risen and fallen all over the world, passing from worse to better and from better to worse.

Dean Inge says: "Of progress in these larger movements, there can be no thought. The notion that the universe as a whole is progressing Mr. Bradley has stigmatized as 'non-sense unmeaning and blasphemous.'"

Strange to say, one of the most significant, though much combated, interpretations of human history, written since the war by one of Germany's greatest scholars, leans hard toward the oriental theory of cyclic recurrence. It is found in a volume by Oswald Spengler, entitled, *Der Untergang des Abendlandes* (The Downfall of Western Civilization). His main thesis is that human history is not to be symbolized by a continuously ascending curve, but by a line with a succession of humps, indicating rise and fall but not necessarily proving progress. He finds in the historic past eight ripe cultures which have come and gone—the Chinese, the Babylonian, the Egyptian, the East Indian, the Greco-Roman, the Arabian, the Mayan (Yucatan and Mexican), and our own Western, the European and American. Each of these is indigenous, bound to its own soil and not transplantable. Each has its own virtues but, also, its seeds of decay and death. The life of a civilization is about a thousand years, and then it begins to decline. Decline it must, for it is organic and all things organic are subject to disintegration and dissolution; they have their birth and childhood, manhood and old age. When these great civilizations have come and gone, humanity is practically on the same level as before.

At this point it is interesting to cite a passage from Herder's *Philosophy of the History of the Civilization of Humanity*, published in 1774, in which he sets forth the theory of historical development which has so deeply influenced modern thinking. In direct opposition to the view of Spengler, Herder says: "Has there not been progress and development in a higher sense? The growing tree, the struggling man, must pass through various stages always progressing. But the striving is not simply individual and

temporal, it is eternal. No one is alone in his age; he builds on what goes before. The past and the present are the bases of the future. This, the analysis of nature and of God's works in general, shows. Thus it is also with the human race. The Egyptian could not be without the Oriental; the Greek built on both; the Roman rose upon the shoulders of the entire world. Genuine progress, constant development, even if no individual gain anything thereby, this is the purpose of God in history."

There is, however, a more hopeful interpretation of the world process, even in ancient times, running parallel with the theory of decadence and of recurrence. The idea of progress, for some reason or other, powerfully gripped certain of the Greeks and Romans at a certain stage in their history. The word itself is derived from the Latin, but does not appear in our sense of the term until Rome became mistress of the Mediterranean World. While the word is Roman, it conveys Greek thought, summarized and applied by the Romans. Greek thinkers like Xenophanes and Empedocles, also, Plato and Aristotle, allude to a steady process in things, including man himself, from lower to higher forms. It is described in immortal verse by Æschylus in the plaintive cry of Prometheus:

But those woes of men,

List ye to them,—how they, before as babes,
By me were roused to reason, taught to think;
And this I say, not finding fault with men,
But showing my good-will in all I gave.
For first, though seeing, all in vain they saw,
And hearing, heard not rightly. But, like forms
Of phantom-dreams, throughout their life's whole length
They muddled all at random; did not know
Houses of brick that catch the sunlight's warmth,
Nor yet the work of carpentry. They dwelt
In hollowed holes, like swarms of tiny ants,
In sunless depths of caverns; and they had
No certain signs of winter, nor of spring
Flower-laden, nor of summer with her fruits;
But without counsel fared their whole life long,
Until I showed the risings of the stars,

And settings hard to recognise. And I
 Found Number for them, chief device of all,
 Groupings of letters, Memory's handmaid that,
 And mother of the Muses. And I first
 Bound in the yoke wild steeds, submissive made
 Or to the collar or men's limbs, that so
 They might in man's place bear his greatest toils;
 And horses trained to love the rein I yoked
 To chariots, glory of wealth's pride of state;
 Nor was it any one but I that found
 Sea-crossing, canvas-winged cars of ships:
 Such rare designs inventing (wretched me!)
 For mortal men, I yet have no device
 By which to free myself from this my woe.

Strange as it may sound, we are told that Plato does not seem to have had the idea of mankind learning by the lessons of history, of knowledge being handed down from one age to another, and growing in the process. It remained for modern times to come under the inspiration of that conviction. A German writer has spoken of history as the long Odyssey of the human spirit, the common mind of man coming at last through its wanderings to find out what it really wants, and where its true home lies.

Lucretius, the Roman poet, was the first to use the word itself, *progređientes*, when he draws a highly original picture of the upward movement of the world and of human society. At the end of the fifth Book, on the *Nature of Things*, he describes man's struggle for life in the stage when he lived with the beasts of the field and was ignorant of tillage, fire, clothes, and houses; and had not laws, government, or marriage. He traces the use of huts, skins, and fire, the rise of speech, the art of cooking, the building of towns, private ownership of property, the worship of gods, the working in metals, the making of tools, sewing, planting, reaping, the cultivation of the soil, the coming of music, instrumental and vocal, in imitation of the singing birds and the whistling of the winds through the reeds.

Then, in a concluding paragraph, Lucretius enumerates all the chief discoveries of men in the age-long process—

ships, agriculture, walled cities, laws, roads, clothes, songs, pictures, statues, and the pleasures of life—and adds, “these things practice and the experience of the unresting mind have taught mankind gradually as they have *progressed* from point to point.”

Of course Lucretius thinks of progress in the arts, and those arts only, which affect man's temporal happiness. He fails to mention increase in knowledge and virtue and love; the qualities that make for the timeless and spaceless life. Nor does he hint at the possibility of infinite progress. It is enough that a man settle down to a quiet and sensible enjoyment of the good things that human skill provides for us here and now.

During the millennium of the so-called Dark Ages, which were by no means always densely dark, men were not in the mood to think of progress in this world. The Church never encouraged the belief that men are steadily growing better. In the papal Syllabus of 1864, we find the following pronouncement: “If any one say that the Roman Pontiff can and ought to reconcile himself to and agree with progress, liberalism and recent civilization, let him be anathema.”

Men set their hope on another world. Even Roger Bacon, who was the precursor of modern science, confidently expected the speedy coming of the end of this world. Progress of nations, tribes, and communities on earth, in knowledge and skill and happiness, was not then in the mind of the Catholic Church. Yet certain medieval men have made an invaluable contribution to the idea of progress, shifting interest from material comforts to intellectual and spiritual advancement. It meant the gradual purification of the soul in order to fit it for communion with God here and hereafter. They had a passionate love and desire for moral improvement. Among others St. Bernard and St. Francis stand out in bold relief. The new elements in the idea of progress are defined by Nicholas of Cusa, in the early fifteenth century, who says: “To be able to understand more and more

without end is the type of eternal wisdom. . . . Let a man desire to understand and to love more what he does love and the whole world will not satisfy him." Here is a fine sense of values—more knowledge and more love are the supreme thing. These are worth more than the whole world. At the same time they embrace all mankind; for knowledge and love can not be qualities of the individual apart from his relation to his fellows.

Thus we see that the content of the word progress is enriched from time to time; there is progress in the meaning of progress. Different aspects of human life are included in it. The concept expanded in the modern age when men made gigantic strides in the exploration and the subjugation of the world about them. DesCartes tells us that he looks to science to furnish us ultimately with an art which will make us "masters and possessors of nature . . . and this not solely for the pleasure of enjoying with ease the good things of the world, but principally for the preservation and improvement of human health which is both the foundation of all other goods and the means of strengthening the spirit itself." It is significant that the two words—progress and humanity—came into use in their modern sense side by side. The latter is the basis and the inspiring ideal of the former.

The philosophers of the eighteenth and the scientists of the nineteenth century worship at the altar of progress. It is proclaimed with the ardor of a new gospel. Turgot, before the French Revolution, declared that "the total mass of the human race marches continually, though sometimes slowly, towards an ever-increasing perfection." Herschel said: "Man's progress towards a higher state need never fear a check, but must continue till the very last existence of history." Herbert Spencer heralds the necessary perfectibility of man with apostolic assurance. "Progress," he says, "is not an accident but a necessity. What we call evil and immorality must disappear. It is certain that man must become perfect. . . . Always towards perfection is

the mighty movement—towards a complete development and a more unmixed good." These modern men of the last two centuries began to dream of a millennium without miracle; a sort of irresistible tide bearing men on to perfection, in spite of themselves, coming in an automic way by inherent necessity.

In this respect they were unlike their seventeenth century predecessors who believed that perfection could be attained only by self-determination of the human will and not by the inevitability of fate. The visions of these prophets of progress were supposed to be proved beyond the possibility of doubt by the three great modern philosophies—Hegelian development, Comte's positivism, and Darwinian evolution. Dean Inge, however, says: "None of these philosophies is really favorable to the belief which it was supposed to support."

In the light of this historical survey, we can understand, not only how the idea has come to be, but, also, why it is so widely prevalent and deeply rooted in the modern world.

II

So far we have not ventured a definition of progress. We can not, however, discuss the evidences for the fact before we come to some understanding of the term. What is the test or criterion of progress? Without a standard of measurement or a definite goal to be reached, we can not tell whether or not there is progress in the history of mankind. On the meaning of the idea there is a wide difference of views. Mr. F. S. Marvin speaks of a Sunday afternoon when he happened to be walking with two friends in Oxford—one a professor of philosophy, the other a lady. The professor declared that to him human progress must always mean primarily the increase of knowledge; the editor urged the increase of power as its most characteristic feature, but the lady added at once that to her progress had always meant, and could only mean, increase in our appreciation of

the humanity of others. These three views need not be held apart as three different definitions. We probably shall be nearer the mark if we blend them into one, so that progress includes increase in knowledge, power, and appreciation of the humanity of others.

Other definitions from various points of view deserve consideration. In our industrial age men have thought of progress as that kind of improvement that can be measured by statistics—by feet and miles, horse-power and voltage, dollars and pounds. Disraeli says: "The European talks of progress because by the aid of a few scientific discoveries he has established a society which has taken comforts for civilization." The English statesman here draws a distinction that the occidental man is liable to forget—men may have the comforts of civilization without having much of the spirit of culture. It does not necessarily follow that if our fathers walked at the rate of four miles per hour and we ride on an automobile at the rate of forty miles an hour, that we are ten times better than our fathers. Is a nation on wheels much happier than a nation afoot or on horseback? It is by no means an inevitable conclusion that because, under the restraints of the Eighteenth Amendment, we drink less whiskey than our fathers, we are therefore more temperate than they were. We may be drier than they, and thirstier than they, and soberer than they, but not necessarily more virtuous. We may at least raise the question whether or not negative prohibitions beget positive virtues. You may put a man into a palace with a half dozen bath-tubs, oriental rugs in every room, electric lights blazing with the splendor of noon, self-regulating hot-water heaters, garages well stocked with the latest models, and bonds with sufficient coupons to support the family sumptuously year in and year out; and yet you may not advance him in civilization by the length of a hair's breadth. Considerations like these make us hesitate before we exorbitantly estimate the value of progress that comes merely through scientific inventions, or that can be statistically measured and tabulated.

Herbert Spencer's definition naturally attracts attention. "The progress of mankind," he says, "is, under one aspect, a means of liberating more and more life from mere toil and having more and more life available for culture, for gratification, for travel, for games." This, of course, is only "one aspect," or perhaps better only a condition, of progress. The fact that men have more time for culture, travel and games by no means proves that they will use their time for these purposes. Agnes Repplier asks the very pertinent question: "What are people doing with the time they are saving when they ride so fast?" I once had the privilege of traveling on the eighteen or twenty hour limited running on the Pennsylvania Railroad between New York and Chicago. When I looked about me and surveyed the ladies and gentlemen comfortably lounging in their chairs and moving through space at sixty miles an hour, I could not help but wonder whether it made any difference to them or to the general welfare of America, whether any of them arrived in Chicago four hours earlier or later. Leisure available for culture is one thing, culture achieved by the effective use of leisure is another.

It was a momentous day in the life of Rousseau, and in a way in the history of modern thought, when his eye fell upon a proposition, published in the *Mercur de France*, the same to be the subject for a prize essay for the ensuing year, phrased as follows: "Has the progress of the sciences and arts contributed to corrupt or purify morals?" Rousseau says: "The moment I read this I seemed to behold another world and became a different man." He was suddenly gripped and transformed by the vision of a new truth, namely, that the growth of the sciences and arts alone is not proof of the ethical or spiritual progress of man. It may, or it may not, corrupt or purify morals; the decisive answer one way or another must be found elsewhere than in the arts and sciences themselves; possibly in the will of man or in the grace of God.

Whither shall we turn to find a satisfactory definition of progress? One is always well repaid by an appeal to the Greeks. Mr. G. H. Perris, in his *History of War and Peace*, says: "The Greeks created a new world of science and art, established an ideal of the sane mind in the sane body and the perfect man in the perfect society, cut out a new line of progress between anarchy and despotisms and made moral ends supreme over national in the state." We may add here Aristotle's definition, whom Dante describes as the master of them that know. He says: "Man at his best, in trying to realize his true nature, should aim at a happiness which involves a harmony of all his faculties, a harmony inspired and led by the highest faculty of all, the Reason which rejoices in contemplation of what is at once true and good and beautiful."

According to the purest Greek thought, progress involves the love of God, the love of neighbor, the love of nature, self-development, political life, scientific study, poetic contemplation and philosophic speculation—all united in one comprehensive and glorious task. In short two factors are involved in the idea—the improvement of the individual and the improvement of the social order of which the individual is an inseparable part; the goal is the perfect man in the perfect society, the symmetrical development of the whole man and the whole social order, material, mental and moral, with the maintenance of the relative value of each.

Did the Greek believe this could be accomplished? He hoped and he hesitated. Both Plato and Aristotle built their hopes on a small circle of cultured Greeks and even these may not all attain the end. On that account they felt keenly the ever-baffled struggle in nature and man. The perpetual defeat of the highest in this conflict with the lower in the heart of man was the essence of tragedy. The tragic hero is the man of innate nobleness who yet has some defect that lays him open to ruin.

To complete our survey of the various definitions of prog-

ress, we shall have to turn to the Christian groups who were neighbors to the Greeks. The Nazarene set a high mark above even that of Aristotle when he exhorted his disciples, saying: "Be ye perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." He proclaimed an unparalleled social ideal when he announced the coming of the Kingdom of God and set forth its controlling principle in the Sermon on the Mount. The Apostle Paul, in other words, says the same thing. In an isolated but highly suggestive passage, he looks forward to the time when the whole creation shares in "redemption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." He rises to sublime heights when he addresses his Ephesian converts as "no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth into an holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye, also, are builded together for an habitation of God in the spirit." The hope of the saints is depicted in the last chapter of the New Testament, in the vision of a new heaven and a new earth in which dwelleth righteousness. In passages, like these, we catch a glimpse of the latent possibilities of humanity and the final aspirations of the men of God, which tower as majestically over the dreams of sages and the speculations of philosophers, as the Jungfrau rises above the surrounding hills and plains of Switzerland.

We have reached a conception of progress for all mankind, advancing as one army, though at varying degrees toward the goal of perfection—a perfection both human and divine. We assume that nature's God has a certain idea of humanity, a scheme to be realized in and by the human race. By our conformity to this plan and by our effort to further it, we are judged.

III

The crucial question naturally arises: Are there evidences in history to justify the claims that men are progressing in this way?

That men have fallen into the error of a shallow and an easy-going optimism through misapprehension of the nature and requisites of true progress cannot be denied. They put false confidence in the process of evolution as the sure guarantee of social and individual progress. They took it for granted that progress is a law of nature working *nolens volens*; that evil is a thing incidental to the earlier stages, to be worked off in the later; that "the time-process is a sort of an automic ethical winnowing machine, in which the good will survive and the bad will perish." Against this view not only theologians but scientists have been driven, by scientific facts more than by religious dogmas, to raise vigorous protests. A citation on this point from Mr. Huxley's *Evolution and Ethics* must suffice: "The theory of evolution encourages no millenarian anticipations. The cosmic nature born within us and, to a large extent, necessary for our existence, is the outcome of millions of years of severe training, and it would be folly to imagine that a few centuries will suffice to subdue its masterfulness to purely ethical ends. Ethical nature may count upon having to reckon with a tenacious and powerful enemy as long as the world lasts."

Furthermore, men have been misled by a one-sided progress, chiefly affecting the external phase of life to the neglect of the internal. The Oriental is quick to detect this aspect of western civilization. It may be called a lack of balance coming from the mastery of powers and forces without moral restraint and spiritual vision, resulting in one-sided development which is dangerous to the civilization of both the East and the West. Tagore recognizes the value of science, but science unchecked leads to serious dangers. It gives man freedom in the material world and confers on him the benefits of a larger range of time and space. In the race of life the scientific nation can easily outstrip the non-scientific nation. But the danger is that the mental and material side of man outgrows his spiritual

strength "like an exaggerated giraffe," to use a figure of Tagore, whose head has suddenly shot up miles away from the rest of him, making normal communication difficult to establish.

We cannot refrain from quoting, also, a penetrating analysis and criticism of our present forms of life, which is at the same time a warning against a false presumption of progress. Professor Eucken says: "We resist the democratic system of life (*Demokratismus*) because it is guilty of a false idealization of the sensuous and merely natural man, and is inclined to subordinate the spiritual world to what is merely human; we resist the economic system of life (*Oekonomismus*) because its construction from without inward involves a denial of the independent problems of the inner life, and because it believes the complete happiness of man to be secured by the establishment of conditions of comfort and freedom from care; and finally we reject the political system of life (*Politismus*) because it represses the independence of personality and hence endangers the originality of spiritual creation, and further because it is ready to sacrifice the self-value of spiritual goods for merely utilitarian considerations. In all these tendencies we see an inner sinking in the midst of all outward progress, a treatment of the chief things as secondary things; we see man becoming spiritually smaller."

We must not depreciate civilization and culture as having no value for the restraint of evil and the inspiration of the good. Yet the last war, waged by the most enlightened nations on earth, showed that science and art alone do not hold in check the viciousness of man; but they may even lend themselves to the increase of his power of mischief and destruction.

It is against erroneous views of progress, which may do serious ethical injury, that men like Dean Inge have written. He by no means denies the fact of progress but insists that we stick to the evidence when we hand in our verdict on so

important a case. He does not deny that there is a purpose struggling for realization in history—a far-off divine event toward which the whole creation moves. "Our ultimate aim," he says, "is to live in the knowledge and enjoyment of absolute values—truth, goodness, beauty." At another place he says: "I think that without making a superstition of 'progress,' we may reasonably hope that we are coming to understand better what religion ought to be, and what Christ meant it to be." But such a state of man is not the result of the automatic operations of natural forces—chemical affinity, gravitation, attraction and repulsion; it is a matter of the will and reason of man. If there is to be a reconciliation between the opposing forces in the world, matter and mind, nation and nation, group and group, there must be first of all a reconciliation within man between the things of sense and spirit, an inner harmony through the operation of patience, knowledge, and good-will. No unity can be perfect except that which we achieve within and can develop from our own consciousness and powers.

History seems to furnish irrefutable evidence that humanity has made progress in the increase of both knowledge and power. Contrast the knowledge of the natural world of the primitive savage and the modern scholar, and you must concede that gigantic strides have been taken in the course of thousands of years. All the sciences—astronomy, chemistry, biology, geology, botany, psychology, anatomy, medicine, law and sociology—without further argument prove that progress is not merely a mental concept but an actual fact. Of course one may still question whether or not the accumulation of knowledge is in itself a benefit or a bane to men. It seems at times, to use a scathing phrase of John Stuart Mill, as if those "utilities, fixed and embodied in material objects," alone were reproduced and highly valued. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that we have newspapers instead of books, "process" work for pictures, "movies" for plays, casts for sculpture, molds of concrete

for architecture, pianolas and phonographs for music, canned goods for fresh vegetables and meat, ready-bought delicatessen for the art of cooking, flats for homes, correspondence schools in place of the living teacher, trust and labor unions for personal initiative, machinery for handicraft, "applied sciences" for the arts, and crowd-imitation or the mob spirit for the free mind. May we hope that things like these are only the passing shadows cast by the onward and upward moving race.

With greater knowledge men have gained, also, more power for the control over the forces of the universe about them. About four hundred years ago they circumnavigated the globe; a few months ago they circumaviated the earth; a few weeks ago they transzeppelinled the Atlantic. The powers of earth and water, air and ether, gas and radium have been subdued by men and are made to do his bidding. "It is estimated," we are told by a writer in the *Atlantic Monthly*, July, 1924, "that the energy generated in central stations will triple in the next ten years and that in the course of that decade the people of the country will spend twenty billions of dollars for electric services in homes, factories and mines. In the Pacific Coast states, installed primary power increased 540 per cent. from 1899-1919, and a million horse-power is now under development in California."

So far as power takes the form of wealth, we, in the United States, are not only, in the language of Matthew Arnold, "too beastly prosperous," but we are getting to be diabolically rich. Think of it, in a single recent year, the people of this country have saved twelve and a half billions of dollars. In 1876 in an address before the Johns Hopkins University, Mr. Huxley said: "I cannot say that I am in the slightest degree impressed by your bigness, or your material resources, as such. Size is not grandeur, and territory does not make a nation. The great issue, about which hangs a true sublimity and the terror of overhanging fate, is what are you going to do with these things."

Most significant of all the forms of power is the quality of "collective power"—the ability on the part of larger and smaller groups of men, intelligently and voluntarily to act together in the pursuit of a definite purpose and of maintaining the ground that has been occupied by gradual advance. In this direction lies the hope of mankind.

With all our knowledge and power we need something more potent enthroned in the heart of man that will give nobility of purpose to the forces at our command. Mr. Bertrand Russell may be classed as a philosophical pessimist. We must not on that account, however, dispose too hastily of his judgment. He says: "I am compelled to fear that science will be used to promote the power of dominant groups rather than to make men happy"—"Science enables the holders of power to realize their purposes more fully than they otherwise could do. If their purposes are good, this is a gain; if they are evil, it is a loss. In the present age, it seems that the purposes of the power-holders are in the main evil. . . . Therefore at present science does harm by increasing the power of rulers. Science is no substitute for virtue." If he is wrong in his judgment about the mind and heart of the dominant groups, he is certainly right about his estimate of the moral qualities of mere science. We must look elsewhere for our hope of true progress.

To revert to the idea of progress of the Oxford lady, we may call it "an increase in our appreciation of the humanity of others." Marvelous, indeed, have been the enlargement of the geographical horizon of the Western world, the inventions and discoveries, the development of imperial states with extensive colonies and foreign possessions, since the fourteenth century. But greater than these was the expansion of the soul of man with an increasing sense of the organic unity of humanity and of the necessity of coöperation of each group in the race with the others for the welfare of all.

There is a clearly growing sense of responsibility of the

forward nations to share their highest attainments with the backward peoples of the earth. This, of course, is not to be done by might nor by power, by violent conquest nor coercive exploitation, but by the impartation of spirit and ideas, as a trustee would develop and help his ward. "The gifts of humanity, all humanity must enjoy and thrive on; or humanity will grow poorer and decay, including the more richly blessed."

It took long ages to develop this feeling of intertribal and international coöperation and generosity. Time was when savage tribes wandered through forest, over moor and desert, wholly isolated from one another. When they came into contact, they fought and ate one another. Then the strong dominated and enslaved the weak. There were monarchs and subjects, ruling nations with their dependencies. Later several great powers asserted their independence and by force of arms maintained peace, with occasional wars in which one ruler attempted to establish his authority over the others and to control the earth. It was a form of internationalism based upon the device of the balance of power. Finally men began to see visions and dream dreams of a federation of nations, a parliament of men. Out of it all emerged the League of Nations.

We are told that in the middle of the fifteenth century the first ships of the Portuguese coasted down to Guinea, under the direction of Prince Henry the Navigator, to see if they could capture any man or hunt down any woman or boy, whereby the desire of their Lord might be satisfied. The Dutch, the French, the English were soon in hot pursuit of the same game. By a provision of the Treaty of Utrecht, not much more than two hundred years ago, the right to send a ship to convey slaves from West Africa to the Spanish colonies in the new world was extorted by the English from the French.

It is a far cry from Prince Henry the Navigator to President Wilson, the ardent champion of the League of Nations,

the supreme purpose of which is to end war by establishing, between nations large and small, a reign of justice and goodwill—an appeal to reason rather than to arms in the settlement of international difficulties. It is well worth while to cite a passage or two from the constitution of the League. In Article XXII we find the following:

“To those Colonies and Territories which, as a consequence of the late War, have ceased to be under the sovereignty of the States, which formerly governed them, and which are inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world, there should be applied the principle that **THE WELL-BEING AND DEVELOPMENT OF SUCH PEOPLES FORM A SACRED TRUST OF CIVILIZATION**, and that securities for the performance of this trust be embodied in this covenant.”

Article XXIII is as follows:

“Subject to and in accordance with the provisions of international conventions existing or hereafter to be agreed upon, the Members of the League

“(a) will endeavor to secure and maintain fair and humane conditions of labour for men, women, and children, both in their own countries and in all countries to which their commercial and industrial relations extend, and for that purpose will establish and maintain the necessary international organization;

“(b) undertake to secure just treatment of the native inhabitants of territories under their control;

“(c) will entrust the League with the general supervision over the execution of agreements with regard to the traffic in women and children, and the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs;

“(d) will entrust the League with the general supervision of the trade in arms and ammunition with the countries in which the control of this traffic is necessary in the common interest;

"(e) will make provision to secure and maintain freedom of communications and of transit and equitable treatment for the commerce of all Members of the League. In this connection the special necessities of the regions devastated during the war of 1914-18 shall be borne in mind;

"(f) will endeavor to take steps in matters of international concern for the prevention and control of disease."

Whether or not these purposes can at once be realized, it means a great deal that at last an ideal is set before the nations which will continue to lure them onward and upward, until the attainment of an internationalism that is based on dictates of sound reason and on the principles of divine revelation. For an abiding internationalism must be founded, not on treaties and covenants which can be torn up as scraps of paper or manipulated and twisted by wily diplomats so as to destroy its very life, but on unity of thought, aims, hopes, interests, and hearts.

In the light of these facts and in the perspective of history, we believe that we may confidently affirm progress in the appreciation of the humanity of others.

With equal assurance do we speak of progress in the religious life of men. It is a long way from the fetish to the Christ, from polytheism to monotheism, from human sacrifices to justice, mercy and a humble walk before God—a way that cannot be measured by years or miles but by the travail of generations who through pain and blood have toiled upward and onward. Progress in religion appears in a finer sense of the value of the individual man, in the ideas of conduct for the individual and society, in the conception of the person, nature, and character of God, in the view of man's relation to God and God's relation to the world. In the history of religion and of the race one finds a steady drive towards a morality that is ever higher, towards monotheism with the qualities of righteousness and love, and toward the bringing of an ever larger portion of human life under religious control. The human soul refuses to be satisfied on

any level save the highest, and as some one has said: "Man is for nothing so grateful as for the advancement of his spiritual life."

Yes, in the soul of man there is evidence for progress as well as in the process of history. Man aspires, hopes, looks upward, strives onward. The climbing instincts in him are irresistible; he is restless and discontented with things as they are. The scope of his vision and the reach of his hope are beyond the spatial and the temporal in the infinite and the eternal. The first Christian poet, Prudentius, speaks of hope as the distinctive characteristic of mankind; and the great apostle says: "We are saved by hope."

We may doubt our intuitions and dismiss them as a fraud. So many have done in the past and are doing in the present. A Greek wrote the epitaph for his own tombstone:

"I've entered port. Fortune and Hope, adieu!
Make game of others, for I've done with you."

Lord Brougham chose this epigram to adorn his villa at Cannes.¹

But is there not an instinct deeper even than our hopes and that is the conviction of the trustworthiness of our soul's intuitions? Here is a realm of certitude perhaps more certain than the inductions of science and the deductions of philosophy. In the words of Browning:

"I go to prove my soul!
I see my way as birds their trackless way.
I shall arrive! what time, what circuit first,
I ask not, but unless God send his hail
Or blinding fireballs, sleet or stifling snow,
In some time, his good time, I shall arrive.
He guides me and the bird. In his good time!"

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE REFORMED CHURCH IN THE U. S.
LANCASTER, PA.

¹ Inge, *Outspoken Essays*, Second Series, p. 177.

II

NATIONAL EDUCATION

A. E. TRUXAL

Nothing affects a nation more vitally than the education of its people. In order to be faithful to the trust resting upon it as a nation it is under an abiding obligation to make provision for the education of its young people from generation to generation. Our country learned this lesson gradually. In colonial days and afterwards education was in the hands of the people in each community. Usually the first public buildings erected in a settlement were the church and the schoolhouse, and frequently the schoolhouse came first. For higher education academies were established here and there throughout the country and colleges were founded by the different religious bodies. The schools of that period were maintained by the tuition of the pupils and voluntary contributions of citizens. Good results were produced by this order. However in the course of time it came to be realized that the system was in some particulars seriously defective. Many of the poor people were unable to pay for the education of their children. Some parents were indifferent and careless in regard to the matter. Philanthropists saw the wrong in this condition and statesmen realized that under our form of government it was essential that all the people should receive at least a primary education. "We must educate or we must perish" expressed their convictions. As a consequence one state after another established a system of public education supported by taxation and free to all the children in each community. And in these latter days many of the states have enacted laws making attendance at these schools compulsory on the part of all children of a given age. The national government

has established an educational department at Washington which gives information, encouragement and support in various ways to the states in their work of educating the people.

Are the states and the nation operating in the line of their proper functions in taking charge of the education of the rising generations? Is it their province to educate the children of the nation? The vast majority of the people of the country believe it to be their province and their duty to do so. However there are some citizens and some churches that deny this right to the state—using the term state in its general sense. They claim that the education of the children of right belongs to the control of parents and of the church. Their contention is that religion is an essential element in a true education, and that it is something the state cannot furnish. Our nation is prevented by its constitution to maintain an established form of religion and the several states are forbidden to teach any sectarian religion in their schools. Hence the charge is made that our state schools are necessarily irreligious and godless. Of the foundation for this charge I shall speak later in this paper. Whether the state is exercising a legitimate function in maintaining a system of education for its rising generations depends upon the conception of the nature of the state that is entertained.

I

The state is a social entity with a life peculiarly its own. This statement is denied by some with the declaration that the state is simply a collection of individuals. But the facts in the case seem to me to establish beyond any doubt that the state is something more than a mere collection of individuals loosely joined together. Historically the state is a growth from the family. The process was from the family to the patriarchal order; from that to the tribe; and from the tribe to the nation. The nation or state is the final result of a development in obedience to the laws im-

planted by the Creator in the nature of man. The state is consequently the expression of a divine idea and may be regarded as a divine institution. Jesus recognized the reality of the state when He said: "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." And St. Paul speaking of civil government affirmed that "the powers that be are ordained of God." The conception that the state consists only of a collection of individuals is sought to be proven by the fact that if the individuals were removed there could be no state. The conclusion reached by the argument is a non sequitur. Remove the branches, trunk and roots of the tree and it no longer exists. But that does not prove that as long as it did exist it was not possessed of a common, central life that vivified and gave character to its outward manifestation. In like manner there are fundamental principles underlying every nation which give to it its own peculiar life and determine the nature of its aims and activities. Its common life grows out of these principles. They give to it unity, strength and efficiency. The principles upon which our nation is founded are lodged in the Constitution of the United States. All the laws enacted by congress and by the legislatures of the several states, as well as the activities of individual citizens and groups of individuals, are required to be in harmony with the national Constitution which is the fundamental law of the land. The governing principles of our country are freedom of thought and investigation, freedom of speech and of the press, freedom of religion, vocation and travel, the rule of the majority and obedience to the laws. This liberty guaranteed to individuals and to groups however is not absolute. It necessarily is limited. No individual possesses the liberty in speech or press or religion or act to injure another individual; and no group of individuals has the right to do that which will be injurious to the nation as a whole. The life of the nation produced by the practice of its principles, cultivated and maintained by the institutions of those principles, is something larger.

broader and deeper than the life of any individual or of any minor section of individuals. No individual ever actualizes fully the national life. The very persons who claim to be a hundred per cent. American usually are violators of some American principles. There is an element of truth in the statement, that a nation is what its citizens are; but there is much more truth in the other statement, that the people are what their nation is. The principles and institutions of any nation, and the activities, modes of life and general culture that flow therefrom exert a marked influence upon its people physically, morally and spiritually. As a result the people of the various nations are not alike. The Italian is not like the Frenchman, the Frenchman not like the German, the German not like the Englishman, and the Englishman not like the American. There are some marks, large or small, that differentiate them. A hundred men seated at a banquet table, one half of them Englishmen, the other half Americans, dressed alike, looking alike, acting alike, as long as they are silent cannot be nationally distinguished; but as soon as they begin to speak the nationality of each will be revealed. The second generation of English people locating in our country will become definitely American; those of the common people will learn the proper use of the letter H. The general spirit and life of any nation have a moulding effect on its citizens. Ideas, conceptions and principles are invisible and spiritual but they are none the less real forces involved in the national entity. A state without fundamental principles to guide and control it would be like a ship without a rudder, driven hither and thither by every wind that blows. In order to maintain itself and accomplish its mission under the providence of God the state must be true to its own life and objectives. The essence of a nation is found in the inward dynamic forces which though spiritual are more real and powerful than its outward form and material resources. The state is a social entity.

II

In order to the maintenance of its principles and the accomplishment of its objectives it is very essential that there be general unity in the thoughts and feelings and purposes of the people of the nation; and the most efficient factor for the maintenance of this unity is education. It is accordingly very important that the nation have control in some form of the education of the rising generations. It matters not whether the work of educating be carried on by the different states of the union or by churches or other groups of people, it remains the province and paramount duty of the nation to see to it that it in no case contravenes the principles of the nation, but supports them, and that all the children be reached in every community. The history of education in our country has laid the duty of educating the people within its borders upon each state in the union. All of the states are maintaining systems of education and some of them are compelling the children up to a given age to attend the established schools. Each state controls the education of its people according to its own wish and wisdom. This order affords the opportunity for a diversity of forms and for the development of special ideas. And yet a general sameness of objectives is maintained throughout the entire system. The Federal government maintains an educational department which in various ways gives encouragement, inspiration and general direction to the work of the several states. The tendency of its efforts is to unify the system as a whole. Then there are also other forces in operation that result in the cultivation of sameness of ideas, methods and general spirit in the cause, such as state conventions of teachers and superintendents addressed by educators of other states; national conventions in which representatives of all the states take part; similar text books used all over the land; books and periodicals read and studied by educators in all sections of the country, and the annual reports of the United States Commissioner of Education

setting forth the work as carried on by the different states and giving a bird's-eye view of education in all the civilized nations of the world. For the purpose of emphasizing the importance of unity in the objectives to be accomplished by education the proposition is now under serious consideration of making the Federal Commissioner a member of the President's cabinet. Let it be remembered that our country is not an empire composed of different nationalities, but that it is one nation constituted of states that grew naturally out of this one nation and are composed in a general way of the same kind of people. It is a legitimate requirement that the same ideas and ideals shall prevail throughout the entire land. Hence the necessity of unifying our educational system and the importance of having all the children receive their primary education in the schools of the country. Private and parochial schools are anomalous institutions and ought to be deprecated. The tendency of private schools is the cultivation of a caste spirit which is not American and parochial schools are of a divisive nature which is also un-american. The cultivation of a common national life and spirit in the rising generations demands that they be educated in the same schools and in the same language. The English may or may not be the best language in the world, but it is the language of our country, and it became its language legitimately and providentially; and all the children ought to be brought up in the language of the country and all foreigners who come to dwell in our midst ought to learn the English language without delay, and send their children to the public schools. This is but a reasonable and decent demand.

III

Many groups of foreigners are scattered throughout our country, in cities and rural districts, who employ the languages of their native lands, and scores of papers and magazines are published in foreign languages. These periodicals might serve a very good purpose if they urged their readers

to learn the English language, acquire American customs and adopt American modes of life. But this is something they are not apt to do. Their aim is much more likely to be the preservation of foreign languages and customs in this country as long as possible; and by such a course they are an injury both to their own people and to their adopted country. The only wise and proper course for foreigners to pursue is to seek the Americanization of themselves and their families as speedily as possible. The great mistake the Germans who came to this country in colonial times and afterwards made, and in some cases are still making, was in clinging to the German language and customs in church and school and social relations, and in opposing the introduction amongst them of the English language and American ideas and ideals. In consequence of their attitude they failed to move forward into the life and spirit of the institutions of the land and to gain the position and exert the influence in the country to which they were entitled by their numbers and ability. The English and Scotch and Dutch and even the Irish elements by far outstripped them. The Germans produced no President, very few United States Senators and unless I am mistaken no member of the Supreme Court of the United States. If they had pursued a different course, acquired the English language, imbibed the American life and spirit, sent their children to the schools of the country and asserted their mental and moral powers, they would have gained a higher position among their fellow citizens, exerted a larger influence and accomplished more good for their country and for themselves. The same spirit seems to actuate some of the Germans who have more recently settled in our country. They call themselves German-Americans and in many cases they are more German than American. The only wise and decent course for immigrants of foreign nations to pursue, whether they locate singly or in groups, is to acquire the language, customs and modes of life of their adopted country. If they do not wish to do

that, they ought to remain in their native lands. And they ought to have their children educated in the schools of the country. It seems to me to be high time for the Federal government and the governments of the several states to assert their rights and authority in this matter. Whatever the final decision of the courts in the Oregon case may be, it is of paramount importance that a way be found to require all the children of the land to receive a given amount of education in the public schools, in order that their minds and hearts may become imbued with the life and spirit of the country.

IV

The main opposition to the public schools comes from the Catholic church; perhaps not so much from the people as from the hierarchy—the pope and bishops and priests. The large body of Catholic parents would no doubt send their children to the state schools if they were allowed to do as they please in the matter. The state of Oregon not long since passed a law making it compulsory for all children of a given age to attend the schools of the state. That would to a large extent have done away with parochial schools. The law was declared unconstitutional by the courts of the state. The case was then appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States which has not yet rendered its decision. There evidently had been a referendum on the proposed law in the state, for a writer from Portland stated in the *Christian Century* of April 24, 1924, that the two wards in that city most dominantly Catholic gave the largest returns against separate schools. "Many Catholics openly expressed themselves as glad for the opportunity to end the oppression of supporting two school systems as imposed on them by the priests." It is possible if not indeed probable that the people would gladly patronize the public schools if they were not interfered with by the priests whose opposition seems to be bitter and unreasonable. They call the state schools "godless," "seminaries of infidelity," "hot-

beds of immorality," "the cause of heresies," "the breeders of crime," "producing hell upon earth." Here and there some of them are talking of resisting by force the payment of the school tax and at the order of the pope "sending bullets at the breasts of the government agents, rather than pay the tax." One says "we have well ordered and efficient organizations all at the beck and nod of the Hierarchy and ready to do what the Church authorities tell them to do." The Germans were wont to speak of "Der Tag" in which they meant to assert themselves and gain the ascendancy aimed at. So the Catholics seem to be looking forward to and preparing for their Day, "when the time comes in this country, *as it surely will come,*" in which they will maintain what they call their rights. And their rights are made to rest upon the most extravagant claims for the functions and authority of the pope. "He is the supreme ruler of the world;" "He is King of Heaven, of Earth and of Hell;" "He is a crowned Head, a King with temporal possessions;" "The Church is rightly named a SOVEREIGN STATE." They claim authority for the pope to depose kings and set aside constitutions and laws, and "that it is necessary for the salvation of every human creature that he shall be subject to the Roman Pontiff." The conception of education entertained by the supporters of this church is indicated by such statements as the following: "The best ordered and administered state is that in which the few are well educated and the many are trained to obedience, are willing to be directed, content to follow and do not aspire to be leaders." "We believe that the peasantry, in old Catholic countries, two centuries ago, were better educated, although for the most part were unable to read and write, than are the great body of American people to-day."

It seems to me the time has arrived when the government and people of our country ought to take note of the attitude of this group of people toward some of the fundamental in-

stitutions of our land and of their veiled threats against the government. Can men who hold such views be loyal citizens of the United States? Can men who solemnly say: "I do denounce and disown any allegiance as due to any heretical king, prince or state, named Protestant; or to any of their inferior magistrates or officers," be allowed American citizenship? In order that a foreigner may become a citizen of our country he is compelled to renounce his allegiance to any foreign ruler or government, yet citizens of our land swear allegiance to a supreme potentate abroad and are unmolested in their rights of American citizenship.

Can blame attach to non-Catholic citizens for opposing the election of Catholics to high and responsible offices in our government? Are men who hold their allegiance to another sovereign ruler to be trusted with rule and authority in our country? The men who give expression to the sentiments of the above quotations may perhaps not represent properly the convictions and feelings of the Catholic church in this country as a whole. Yet the fact that members of the hierarchy should here and there from time to time give utterance to such words is not without significance. Our consolation however is that men and women are often better than their theories and would not follow their principles to their legitimate ends. It must not be forgotten that Catholics have been faithful officers in the state, brave generals in our wars, loyal soldiers in army and navy, and furnished good citizens in every community. Nevertheless in a conflict of our government and the pope would they not stand by the pope!! Their claims for the temporal authority of the pope seem to be the same to-day that they were in all past ages.

The statistics of criminality in the country are the best answer to the charge that our public schools are godless and hotbeds of crime. "Only sixteen per cent. of the population are Catholics," yet "from forty to sixty per cent. of the criminals are of the Catholic faith." Why does the

Catholic faith and education not produce better results? "By their fruits ye shall know them." It seems to the writer that the general condition reached in our country demands that the federal and state governments should assert their authority in bringing all the schools of the land under the influence of the American life and spirit. If private and parochial schools must be tolerated they ought to be compelled to come under the supervision of the superintendent of public instruction. Their curricula and text books ought to be approved by him. He ought to see to it that the principles and institutions of our country be properly explained to the pupils; that the stars and stripes be honored and respected; that the national songs be sung; and that the government of the country represents the supreme authority in temporal and civic affairs. Can the civil government to be true to itself do less than this? Can any group of people who are loyal citizens object to such an arrangement? Yet an archbishop of the Catholic church in 1921, in deciding a case before him *inter alia*, made the following statement: "Such is the essential constitution of the Church given by Jesus Christ, who placed all the powers and rights of government in His visible Kingdom on earth, both in things temporal and things spiritual, exclusively into the hands of His visible Head, the Pope, and in her visible rulers, the bishops." That places the people of their church in abject subjection to the pope and his representatives. The time was when the defenders of human slavery claimed that it was better for the low and ignorant classes to be slaves than free men. So it is held that it is better for the members of the church to be in entire subjection to those in authority over them, that they simply believe and do what they are taught. Here is where Protestants dissent. But on the basis of the above teaching of the Archbishop Catholics claim that the civil government has no right to investigate or exercise any authority in the things maintained and conducted in their churches, schools, asylums and other institutions.

In my opinion the state has no right to yield to this demand. No church has the right to say to it: Hands off! It is the privilege and duty of the state to know what is taught and practiced in any and every institution within its borders. The government does not interfere with the religion of any group of people provided it does not in any way violate the constitution and laws of the country. When the Mormons taught and practiced bigamy in the name of religion the government did interfere because bigamy in the eyes of our laws is a crime. Everything ought to be done publicly and above board before the government. Protestants do not object to this. They court investigation of their schools and other institutions by any and everybody, Catholic as well as Protestant, and are perfectly willing that all their buildings with their equipment and uses and the purposes for which they are maintained shall be open to the government and general public from cellar to garret. There ought to be no secrets from the representatives of the government. And especially ought it to know what the children are being taught and to be satisfied that the teaching and spirit of all schools are in harmony with the principles and institutions of the land.

In the light of Catholic teaching, medieval and modern, and of their past ecclesiastical and civil practices it is no wonder that non-Catholics are suspicious of the complete loyalty of the members of the Catholic church and are opposed to their election to high offices in the nation. It would be an anomaly to say the least for the President of the United States or any other major officer of the country to be at the same time a solemnly pledged subject of a foreign "Sovereign State" or "Sovereign Ruler."¹

V

Our public schools no doubt are lacking in some particulars. It is being felt more and more that in the teaching of

¹ The quotations from Catholic authors in the foregoing section are taken from *Romanism as a World Power* by Luther S. Kaufman.

religion and in moral training they are defective. But they are not godless nor irreligious. In many of them passages from the Bible are daily read; in some of them prayers are offered; the discipline rests upon the moral conceptions of Christianity; the virtues are commended and the vices condemned. In numerous cases religious mottos adorn the walls of the buildings. Yet in these matters there is room for improvement. Our nation from its earliest beginning has been religious, not irreligious; it has been theistic, not atheistic; and it has been prevailingly Christian, and is so yet. The religion of the people has been faithfully protected. All public assemblies and legislative bodies are opened with prayer. The army and navy have their chaplains to minister religiously unto officers and men. Annually the President calls upon the people to assemble themselves in their churches to give thanks to God for His favors and blessings. When the President is inaugurated he takes the oath of office on the Bible. The many thousands of officeholders in the land from the highest to the lowest are required to be properly sworn before entering upon their official duties. The oath is administered to all the judges in the country, to all the attorneys, litigants, jurors and witnesses before they are permitted to perform their several parts in judicial proceedings. The oath is an acknowledgment of God and a confession of responsibility to Him. We are a religious nation and a Christian nation, very imperfectly it is true, just as individual Christians are very imperfect Christians. What good reason can there be for debarring from the schools the religion on which rests the government throughout all its various ramifications? Denominational religion cannot be taught in the public schools but general religion based upon faith in God and an accountability to Him could be taught. The ten commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the 23d Psalm, the 13th chapter of 2d Corinthians and Scripture passages of similar nature would form a proper foundation for such teaching. This would furnish the basis for teaching and training the chil-

dren in the virtues of love and sympathy and kindness and truthfulness and honesty and purity and goodness in general. To this neither Jew, Catholic nor Protestant could object. In my opinion it would not be in violation of the Constitution and would be in harmony with the spirit and life of the people of our country. This kind of teaching and training ought to be included in the curricula of the schools and carried out by the teachers. The end of education is to make true men and women. But men and women without moral integrity and strength do not actualize the true idea of their being. Their intellectual education may be thorough and complete and yet if they are lacking in moral character they are a failure, an injury to themselves and to society. A few years ago the department of education in the state of Pennsylvania worked out a large and complete program of education covering the entire period from the kindergarten to the last year in the high school course, designating particularly all the items that could possibly be included in such a course, and yet from the beginning to the end the subject of morality or the value of moral character is not as much as mentioned. It is high time for the general public to demand of our schools that the children be taught and trained in religion and morals as before indicated, that the matter be made a fixed item in every curriculum, so that an essential element in true education be not omitted. Religion and morals are matters that are not simply to be taught, but they are to be lived; hence I have insisted upon training as well as teaching. In the first place they are to be exemplified by the teacher, for they are things that must in a large measure be caught. And then the children in their study and recitation and play and general conduct are to be trained to practice what they are taught. Such a course would redound immensely to the benefit of both pupils and teacher, and would remove the foundation for the charge that our public schools are godless and not conducive to morality.²

² "All our learning and science, our culture and our arts, will be

VI

The consideration of this subject leads to the following conclusions: First, that our public schools be improved by a more definite teaching of the religion of the country and by the training of the children in the virtues of the soul; that along with their intellectual education a continued effort be put forth for the development of their moral character. What a nation needs, especially a Republic, is intelligent citizens and citizens of moral integrity. If the latter be wanting, the nation will fail in accomplishing its mission. Second, that it is the province and duty of the nation to maintain schools for the primary education of its rising generations; that all the children be required to attend the national schools so that they may become imbued with the fundamental principles and objectives of the nation. The unification of the life and spirit of the country demands this and upon it depends the efficiency and strength of the nation. Parochial and private schools for lower education ought to be discouraged in our country. Third, that the English language be employed in all the schools. Ideas, conceptions, customs and modes of life are more or less bound up with the language of a people. It is of great im-

of little avail unless they are supported by high character, unless there be honor, truth and justice; unless our material resources are supported by moral and spiritual resources there is no foundation for progress. A trained intelligence can do much, but there is no substitute for morality, character and religious convictions. Unless these abide, American citizenship will be found unequal to its task."

From the address of President Coolidge before the Convention of the National Education Association in Washington, June, 1924.

The above mentioned convention in the resolutions adopted has a lengthy paragraph on *Character Education* in which occur such sentences as the following: "Our boys and girls are the greatest asset of the Nation. It is essential that they shall receive proper character training. Honesty, integrity and truthfulness should be emphasized in all the work of the schools." "We believe that religious education is fundamental in the development of character. We urge that the school, the home and the church coöperate fully in the training of our youth."

The above sentiments look in the right direction.

portance that all the people of a country speak the same language. The foreigners in our land have no ground for protest against this demand. I am not unmindful of the fact that Germany was severely condemned, and justly so, for forcing its language upon its conquered people in Poland, Alsace and Lorraine and other sections of the empire. But the foreigners in our country are not conquered peoples. They have come to us of their own volition.

They were not invited but permitted to come, as it was their desire to better their condition in life. True wisdom and common decency would seem to require that they and their children become thoroughly Americanized without unnecessary delay. The most efficient means for the accomplishment of this much desired end are a common language and common schools. It seems to me that the subject of this paper is worthy of the earnest consideration of the statesmen of our country, of the legislators of the several states, and of the educators of the nation.

Note: Arlo Ayres Brown in the *International Journal of Religious Education*, October number, 1924, has the following to say: "But one element in the so-called 'American system' of education has been strangely lacking—religion. One hundred and fifty years ago our public schools were essentially religious in aim and in materials, but for the last seventy-five years they have omitted the direct teaching of religion almost entirely, although they have sought to develop Christian ideals in their students.

"The public mind is just awakening to appreciate the seriousness of this fatal defect. Religion is too vitally needed as a moral dynamic to be ignored, and it is too complex a subject to be understood adequately without careful studying. As someone has rightly said, 'What a tragedy for one to grow up with a man-sized idea of the universe and a child's idea of religion'—not a child's faith, but a child's intelligence on religious subjects."

SOMERSET, PA.

III

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY FROM A LAYMAN'S POINT OF VIEW

F. LYMAN WINDOLPH

I had an uncle, who, though brought up as an Episcopalian, died a member of the Unitarian Church. He disposed of his estate by a will of which he named me the executor. At about the time his estate was distributed, I received a letter from a friend of mine asking me to contribute to a campaign for the spread of Unitarian Christianity throughout the world. In reply I sent a check for a small amount, accompanied by a note in which I said that the contribution enclosed was in memory of my uncle and was to be credited in his name. I added that, except for him, it was unlikely that I should have given anything, because, while I appreciated the services of the Unitarian Church as an instrument of liberalism, I was not a believer in its doctrine. A few days afterwards my friend came to see me on some business or other, and, when just about to leave, referred to what I had written. "If," said he, "you are not a Unitarian, what are you?" I said, "I am a Trinitarian." He said, "Do you really mean to say that you believe in three gods?" I said, "I have no time to answer your question now, and, if I had, you have no time to listen. But some day I will sit down and write an explanation of what I think the doctrine of the Trinity means." This is the explanation, and, to paraphrase Chesterton, if my friend does not understand it, all he has to do is to ask me another question and I will write him another essay.

I have no apologies to offer because of the fact that I am writing this exposition of Trinitarianism without having had any theological training. Neither have nine out of

every ten men whom one meets on the street. Yet the orthodox Christian Church has always advanced, and continues to advance, the doctrine of the Trinity, not as something to be debated and discussed in schools of theology, but as something to be accepted and believed by men and women everywhere.

I have no desire to make converts, and yet, by way of clearing ground, I should like to persuade my readers to make two admissions before going on. The first of these admissions happens to be the point at which my own thinking about the Trinity began, when, years ago, I first came to be skeptical about the merits of skepticism.

In the *Literary Digest* of July 29, 1922, it is said that a Christian Hall of Fame, so to speak, has just been dedicated in the Episcopal Cathedral of St. John the Divine, in New York. A marble parapet at the entrance to the choir has twenty panels, each containing a carved wooden figure—that is, each but the last, which is to be vacant for a while. The nineteen figures, not all of which are ecclesiastical, represent, one to a century, those individuals in history who have most influenced the development of the Christian spirit. The list follows in order: St. Paul, St. Justin Martyr, St. Clement, St. Athanasius, St. Augustine, St. Benedict, Gregory the Great, Charles Martel, Charlemagne, Alfred the Great, Godfrey of Bouillon, St. Bernard, St. Francis of Assisi, John Wycliffe, Columbus, Archbishop Cranmer, William Shakespeare, George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. Some of these men, like St. Augustine, were theologians and philosophers, whose intellectual attainments would have commanded respect and admiration in any land and any time. Some of them, like St. Francis of Assisi, were religious geniuses, without any pretensions to theological preëminence. Some of them were warriors, like Godfrey of Bouillon and Charles Martel. One of them, Shakespeare, was, in the opinion of most critics, the world's greatest poet. All of them, except St. Paul and Lincoln,

were professing Trinitarians, and most of them were active and eager Trinitarians, to whom exile and martyrdom were more tolerable than apostasy. I have excepted St. Paul because he lived and died before orthodox Christianity had made any formal statement of its creed, but he was, nevertheless, through his writings and teachings, the father of Trinitarianism.

I have heard Billy Sunday make use of a list somewhat like the one just given, as an argument in support of the truth of Christianity. For that purpose the argument seems to me a poor one. A school boy can make a list of Greek or Jewish celebrities or of atheists and agnostics who lived during the Christian Era, every whit as imposing as any a Christian apologist can compile. Since this is so, I do not say that the doctrine of the Trinity is to be accepted as true because great men of diverse gifts and varied points of view have given their faith to it. But I do say, first of all, that the doctrine of the Trinity has in fact been accepted as true by philosophers and theologians of the first order, and that, on that account, whether true or not, it must be regarded as theologically respectable.

Let any man take the writings of St. Augustine, for example, and set them over against the works of a modern philosopher like Schopenhauer. The utmost that can be said is that in each case one is confronted with the product of an original and powerful intellect. He would be a bold man who would undertake to say which intellect was the less and which the greater. I am not at all concerned, in the present connection, with what Schopenhauer believed, or with whether what he believed was true or false, but, whatever it was, I am satisfied that it must have been, philosophically speaking, a credible thing. On exactly similar grounds, I cannot persuade myself that St. Augustine gave his allegiance to a palpable and self-demonstrating fallacy. In training and ability, he was not inferior to Schopenhauer, and he had as much information on which to base a con-

clusion. Five thousand years of what we call civilization have not added in the smallest degree to the data which men bring to the consideration of the abiding mysteries of life and death, and of the nature of that Power, which, blindly, or in benevolence or malice, has called human consciousness into being. "Do you really believe in three gods?" said my friend only half seriously. I have heard almost the same words, contemptuously spoken, on the lips of a Jewish Rabbi. We may reject the doctrine of the Trinity, if we please, but it seems to me that we cannot dismiss it with any such superficial inquiry any more than we can dismiss rationalism by asking a rationalist, as a great churchman once asked Sainte Beuve, how it comes about that, if he believes nothing that he does not understand, he is willing to eat an omelette without knowing why it is that the same heat which makes eggs hard makes butter soft.

But not all Christians have been men and women of theological preëminence or, indeed, of any sort of preëminence. On the contrary, Christianity has been, for better or worse, one of the great religions of the world—which is only another way of saying that most Christians have been ordinary men and women. In so saying, I approach the second admission of which I spoke a moment ago. The doctrine of the Trinity, as it seems to me, must not only be conceded to be theologically respectable in theory, but, on even stronger grounds, it must also be conceded to be humanly comforting in fact. Perhaps the significance of this admission will more fully appear a little later on. Just now I am interested in the admission itself, and not in any of its implications.

As much, indeed, may be said, and must instantly be admitted, about any great religion. For all I know, Mormonism may be a heresy which exists only by reason of the deception of its adherents. But Mormonism is less than a hundred years old and, in spite of sensational assertions to the contrary, periodically made, its extent, both numerically and geographically, is distinctly limited. When we turn,

however, to Buddhism or Christianity or Mohammedanism—faiths which have dominated entire continents and commanded the loyalty of millions of worshipers over periods of thousands of years—only one conclusion appears to me possible, viz., that there is in each of these religions something more or less adequate to meet the needs developed by human experience. To put the matter in another way, I do not believe that a large number of people can be wholly duped in a religious way for a long time. When I say “a large number of people,” I mean, of course, hundreds of millions of people, and when I say “a long time,” I mean thousands of years.

We have been looking, as from a great distance, at the outline of orthodox Christianity. I am now ready to step one pace forward, and, in doing so, I am going to assume a belief in the existence of an infinite God. This is a perfectly legitimate assumption, for the purposes of this argument, because I am contrasting the doctrine of the Trinity with other theories about the nature of God, and not with atheism. Whether or not God exists is, of course, a philosophical question of tremendous importance, but it does not concern me now.

In the Nicene Creed the Christian believer is asked to affirm his faith “in one God” and in the “Son of God . . . being of one substance with the Father” and in “the Holy Ghost . . . who proceeded from the Father and the Son.” In other authoritative statements of Christian doctrine it is said that God is one, but, nevertheless, consists of three persons, known as the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, and these Three Persons are collectively referred to as The Holy Trinity, or, more briefly, as The Trinity. I am not striving for any metaphysical subtlety of expression. I am merely using familiar language which appears in the prayer books used by most Christians every Sunday. It is to be presumed, as I have tried to show, that this language means something, and so we come to the question: What does it mean?

I answer, in the first place, that it means something figurative. It may be said that, if this is my step forward, it is really a step sidewise. Whatever the direction may be, the point involved seems to me so exceedingly important that I propose to consider it at a little greater length.

Perhaps I can do no better than to begin with the formality of a syllogism. The major premise is that a finite intelligence cannot comprehend the nature of that which is infinite. I take it that there is no need to prove this proposition further than to say that its contrary is, by the very definition of the words "finite" and "infinite," absurd. The minor premise is that the intelligence of man is finite and that God is infinite. The first part of this proposition is self-demonstrating and we have agreed to assume the existence of an infinite God. The conclusion from the premises stated is that man cannot comprehend the nature of God. But since man may comprehend much that he cannot express, but can in no case express that which he cannot comprehend, it is equally clear, without going through the formalities of another syllogism, that man cannot express the nature of God. It follows, therefore, that men are irresistibly driven to the use of metaphors when they come to speak of the Deity. If logical accuracy is insisted on, we must change these metaphors into similes, and remember that in every theological assertion of an identity, the assertion of a likeness is what is really intended. Let me illustrate what I mean by referring to some religious formulas different from the one now under consideration.

We are told that the ancient Egyptians worshiped crocodiles and cats. It is absurd to suppose that God is a crocodile or a cat. I do not believe it. No intelligent American could be induced to believe it. I do not think for a moment that any intelligent Egyptian ever believed it. But the matter cannot end here. What did these preposterous assertions mean to the architect of the pyramids? Well, I think he believed that, in some terrible and significant and

forgotten way, God was like a crocodile or a cat. The Jews—and with them, modern Unitarians—say that God is a person. There are no degrees in absurdity and such a statement is absurd, because a personality without limitations is a contradiction in terms. To say that God is a crocodile or a cat is no more absurd than to say that he is a person, because, except symbolically, both are absurd. A personality is, however, the noblest thing in the experience of men, and to that extent (and to that extent only) the Jewish figure of speech is better than that of the Egyptians.

Just here I should like to suggest, tentatively, at least one respect in which the orthodox Christian figure of speech is better than either. We have seen, on the clearest possible grounds, that the one confident assertion which may be made about the nature of God is that we cannot in any wise comprehend it. When, therefore, a man says to me that he believes in one God who has three persons, I confess that his meaning is not entirely clear. But I am not surprised on that account, because I did not expect to be able to understand the nature of God. On the other hand, when a man says simply that God is a person, I comprehend exactly what that saying means. But I meet persons every day, and I cannot for a moment accept such a saying as true. I am not unmindful of the fact that to assert that God is a person is as much a metaphor as to assert that he is three persons in one. But, whereas the first metaphor amounts to saying that God is like something comprehensible, which is not true, the second metaphor amounts to saying that God is like something incomprehensible, and, at least, that is true. This does not mean that in theology it is better to talk nonsense than sense. What it means is that, since the nature of the Deity is certainly ineffable, no theological formula can be adequate (even in the human and fallible sense) which seems to assert the contrary. The divine ineffability is the first door which bars the way of every man who would walk into the presence of God, and the key of the Trinitarian doctrine fits this particular lock.

But I have said nothing by which, standing alone, Christian theology ought to be justified. There are many doors and to open one of them is, without more, of no significance. It might be said, for example, that God is a square circle or a four-sided triangle, and such statements (though suggesting incomprehensibility at least as well as to say that God has three persons) would, so far as I can see, be void of meaning altogether. I am, therefore, still face to face with my original question—"What does it mean to say that God is three persons in one?"—modified so as to read, "What does it mean to say that God is like three persons in one?" I am ready to take another step, and the step leads me into the philosophy of pragmatism.

Return with me, as to a starting place, to our one basic conclusion about God—that men are utterly unable to comprehend or express the essential quality of his being. What follows? Well, at the outset, all the metaphysical speculation in the world about the nature of God falls to the ground. Reasoning from *a priori* grounds, philosophers have spoken of God's "self-sufficiency," of his "felicity," of his "indivisibility," and of his "immateriality." These are barren words and they tell us nothing. They come from the dictionary and not from life. They are merely efflorescences from the minds of the particular men who coined them, and, as such, lacking in any objective verification whatever. Moreover—and this is the real point—every such attempt to learn about God by contemplating what may be conceived to be the divine qualities or attributes must, in the very nature of the case, be lacking in objective verification. It begins in the mind of the philosopher and must necessarily end there.

Confronted with this difficulty, the early Christian philosophers came, whether consciously or otherwise, to what seems to me to have been the boldest and most important decision in the history of theology. In brief, they turned from theories to facts and from speculation to experience.

They gave up metaphysical guesses about God's nature, and, instead, asked themselves how and in what ways God enters into the lives of men. Such an inquiry promises success at the outset, because the effects of God in human experience must be finite and, therefore, comprehensible. If mountains are moved by faith, the nature of the motive power may be ever so mysterious, but the extent to which the mountains are moved can be determined by any surveyor. More than a thousand years later Lord Bacon rendered a similar service in the field of the physical sciences by insisting that no science is worthy of the name which does not proceed from known facts to unknown facts, that is, which does not follow the system of inductive logic. A man will get nothing but weak eyes from staring at the sun, but if he turns his back to it, the nerves in the back of his neck will tell him at least that the sun is warm and his eyes will tell him something about the qualities of sunlight by looking at his own shadow. And so, forgetting St. Paul and the Church fathers for a moment, let us ask ourselves like good scientists: What are the facts?

I think we must answer first that God impresses men as a great First Cause, a God of law in and behind nature and human history. The sun rises and sets. Every hour water goes blithely about the great business of seeking a lower level. An ass mates with a mare and begets a mule, but the mule is without hope of posterity. Nations come into being, are glorified or humbled, and, in years enough, are swallowed up and utterly cease to be. That man is a fool who does not see that there is abroad in the world something—call it what you will—which works ceaselessly at a pattern not of men's planning.

It is a comparatively easy thing to justify the ways of God to man, but it is an impossible thing to justify the ways of God to any particular man. Leonidas died at Thermopylæ. The deathless report of his valor ran through Greece like a flame, and the Persian invaders were routed

and broken at Salamis. So Leonidas saved Greece, and western civilization. Over the grave in which he and his soldiers were buried his countrymen put up a monument with this inscription: "Stranger, go tell the Lacedæmonians that we lie here in obedience to their commands." It is the noblest epitaph in the world. *But how does that profit Leonidas, lying dead in dust and defeat?* How does it console a man in a sinking ship to reflect that the law of gravity is, on the whole, a beneficent law? How does it reconcile a blind man with his condition to be told that the sins of his father are thereby visited upon him. No man has ever answered these questions, and Christian theology does not attempt to answer them.

But God does not come into the lives of men solely as the architect of the cosmos, the arbiter of historical and biological survival and the avenger of sin. By a tremendous and enduring paradox, God is not merely a God of Law, but, pragmatically speaking, a God of Exception, not merely a God all powerful over men, but a God incarnate in men, and redeeming them from day to day. Let us consider this paradox, by the truth whereof (if it be not falsehood) Christianity has swept the western world.

"A sound mind in a sound body" was the ideal of the urbane Roman poet. From a sound tree a man of common sense would expect to gather sound fruit and from an unsound tree, unsound fruit. But life does not always run in accordance with the expectations of men of common sense, and One wiser than either poet or horticulturalist reversed the logical process. It is true, He said, that every good tree bringeth forth good fruit and every evil tree bringeth forth evil fruit, but you must judge the tree by the fruit and not the fruit by the tree. To say this is to be a pragmatist. Well, medical authorities have surmised—and perhaps truly—that St. Paul was an epileptic, that St. Theresa suffered from hysteria and that St. Francis of Assisi was an hereditary degenerate. Certainly Cæsar was an epileptic,

Keats was tubercular, Bunyan was a hopeless neurotic, Lincoln suffered from melancholia, and dreamed prophetic dreams. All of these people were biologically damned, and in a society run on eugenic principles would probably never have been born. But the facts are that in one way or another they swung the world. They were, perhaps, what science calls "sports." The name does not matter: the facts remain.

Let us pursue the paradox. When Jesus of Nazareth was born, He came into a world in which some men were good and some bad. Most occidentals would agree in the statement, as a minimum claim, that He was the best man of whom history has any record. In the end, because of the acts of certain bad men, He was crucified. Socrates was the noblest character produced by classic antiquity, but, because some of his fellow citizens were jealous of his influence, he drank hemlock and died. Lincoln is almost universally conceded to have been, up to the present writing, the finest flower of American manhood. Yet the institution of human slavery, which had been established in America before Lincoln was born, set up an evil chain of causation which resulted in his murder. For a generation before the great war, international diplomacy had been an iniquitous thing. Thereby, millions of young men, innocent of that wrong, lie in graves that stretch from Africa over Europe, Asia and Australia to these United States. Think of these things, and then read the passion of Christ in one of the synoptic Gospels, or Plato's *Apology*, or Lincoln's Second Inaugural, or what Roosevelt found the strength to say about his son, slain in the service of his country. Then ask yourselves whether, if you had it in your power to remake the course of history at a word, you would choose the world as it is to-day, or a world in which Christ was not crucified, or Socrates condemned, or Lincoln assassinated, or the heroes of the great war done to death. I think there is only one answer to this question—we would not give up

our martyrs on any terms at all. The innocent suffer for the sins of the guilty, but the result is not merely a better thing than if there had been no innocence. The result is a better thing than if there had been no guilt. This is what theologians call atonement, but here again the name does matter much.

Let me give one more series of illustrations. St. Peter, in what must have seemed to him the crisis of his life, was a coward three times, yet he lived to bear martyrdom without flinching on one of the Seven Hills of Rome. The young St. Augustine was stained with all the vices of a dissolute age, yet he came, deservedly, to be regarded as the first Christian in Christendom. St. Francis of Assisi was won to his ministry from idleness and profligacy. Tolstoy, by his own admission, broke every one of the ten commandments, yet he died, whether one agrees with him or not, the greatest religious influence of his age. The best commentary on the lives of such men is to be found in the parable of the prodigal son. It is the most significant of all parables. The last state of sinners is sometimes better than if they had never sinned. This is the fruit of what evangelists call conversion. Here, finally, the name does not matter, but the facts remain.

Now, in all the respects of which we have been speaking, God impresses men as incarnate in men themselves and as wholly redeeming them from the rigor of his own judgments. The power that damns is, somehow, likewise the power that saves.

But, thirdly, God affects men as a sustaining force. This is, I think, the sort of experience of God which leads theologians to speak of the divine "immanence." . . . "Who spake by the mouths of the prophets," says the Nicene Creed—who spake also, and speaks to-day, through the mouths of the poets and in music and in some of the countless mystic adventurings of the human soul. I confess that it is difficult to enlarge upon this experience of

God, or to set it forth at very great length, but it nevertheless seems to me a very clear one.

I conclude, therefore, as a matter of fact in the scientific sense, that God impresses men in three ways. Is such a conclusion justified? Speaking from my own experience, I think that it is, but my own experience is a very unsubstantial basis on which to assert so momentous a conclusion. Just here, however, we may do well to return to a point about which I suggested I might have something more to say—I mean the fact that orthodox Christianity (which calls God a Trinity) has been accepted, in the course of two thousand years, by almost the whole of the Caucasian race and must, therefore, be held to have been justified by a very comprehensive trial. On the other hand, the number of converts to Judaism and Unitarianism in the same period of time has been meager in the extreme. It may be urged in reply that my argument suggests its own refutation—after all orthodox Christianity is only two thousand years old; it began in Western Asia, spread over Europe, and has practically stopped with the white race. Something is to be said, however, by way of rejoinder. Almost 500 years before the birth of Christ, Plato wrote that the divine nature ought to be considered under a three-fold modification and that the three original principles might be represented as three gods, united with each other by a mysterious and ineffable generation. Consider, too, the Trinity to be found in one form of Buddhism and the *diva triforma* of popular Greek and Roman mythology. Since I began writing this paper I have been told that the idea which I am suggesting has been elaborately worked out in a book called "Ethnic Trinities." I have not seen the book, but I think it is sufficiently clear that the three-sided character of God's relation to man (though not the Christian formula for expressing it) was known in ages before the birth of Christianity and in lands where the Caucasian race has never dwelt.

But to say that men receive three impressions of God is

not to state the whole truth. *The impressions received are not only different from one another, but essentially inconsistent with one another.* I tried to express this fact a moment ago by saying that the power that damns is somehow likewise the power that saves. When speaking to children we sometimes refer to God as The Good Man. However helpful such a phrase may be in instructing a child, God certainly does not run the world as a good man would run it if he were God. We cannot, so long as we speak pragmatically, affirm that our three aspects of God reveal different but connected parts of a single personality. Two alternatives therefore arise. The first is that there are three Gods at work in the universe. William James has suggested, with his usual lucid detachment of view, that modern thinkers have been far too ready to exclude polytheism as a possible theological hypothesis. I do not think that James believed in a plurality of gods, but I agree with him in feeling that some of the evidence points that way. I doubt, indeed, and I think James doubted, whether the existence of only one god can be proved pragmatically. At all events, the question is far too complicated for adequate discussion here. On the other hand, if we exclude the possibility of there being more than one God—and in doing so we have the authority of almost all the great philosophers of the last two thousand years on our side—only one alternative remains. God must be someone (or something) having three personalities which are, nevertheless, one.

Suppose, now, that we try to summarize, with the greatest possible brevity, the whole of what precedes. Is not this a fair summary? All that men know, or can ever know, about the infinite, is what their own finite experiences teach them, and these experiences demonstrate that God is a Creator, a Redeemer and a Comforter. The experiences in question are inconsistent with one another, and cannot be conceived as manifestations of any imaginable single personality. There is one God, but there are three persons in

one God. I remember very well with what a flash of recognition some of these phrases came to me when I first found myself at the point at which we are standing, and suddenly realized that I had been following a very old road. The language of our summary is, of course, in the most literal possible way, the language of orthodox Christianity. We are at the end of the road, and St. Paul and the Church fathers are beside us. This, then, is the doctrine of the Trinity as I have come to believe it.

I might very well stop here except for two inquiries which must present themselves and which I ought to anticipate and answer as well as I can. The first of these is concerned with the part which the historical figure of Jesus plays in the theory of the Trinity which I have been expounding. In reply I can only say that Jesus seems to me, at least for occidentals, the one perfect and entirely authentic example of God incarnate in men. There is nothing implicit in my own philosophy which would exclude on the one hand, or assure on the other, the possibility of such another incarnation in the future. Neither am I disposed to deny, on a priori grounds, that the experience of races other than our own may possibly have revealed equally perfect and authentic incarnations in the past. In other words, I am personally not satisfied that Christianity is necessarily either the world's final religion, or here and now the best religion for all men. If any reader is disposed to contend that by virtue of these admissions I must be classed as a Unitarian, I can do no more than protest. But I do protest that I am not a Unitarian.

I come naturally, by this transition, to the second subject of inquiry. What do I mean by saying that I am a Trinitarian? Or how would I answer a direct question as to whether or not I believe that the doctrine of the Trinity is true? I feel here that I am on very firm ground. Philosophical truth is, of course, not the same thing as mathematical truth or historical truth. Consequently, I do not believe that the doctrine of the Trinity is true in the sense that

I believe that two and two make four or even in the sense that Columbus discovered America. I do not believe that God consists in any sort of identity between three persons. On the contrary, I believe that no man will ever comprehend or express what God is. But I do believe, without any qualification or reservation whatever, that the doctrine of the Trinity is the deepest and most scientific formula for expressing what men know about God, of which the history of human thought has any record. I believe it is a more nearly adequate formula than any sort of polytheism, or than any sort of pantheism, which circumscribes God with the cosmos, or than any sort of deism which circumscribes the cosmos with God. Finally, it seems to me that it is Unitarians rather than Trinitarians who, at bottom, must rest their case upon unverified faith. To say that God is a loving Father, and to stop there, ignores some of the obvious facts of life which must be ignored or reckoned with. It seems to me that Trinitarianism reckons with them.

LANCASTER, PA.

IV

SCIENTIFIC, PHILOSOPHICAL, AND THEOLOGICAL FAITH

A. S. ZERBE

PART I

Science has unearthed a vast number of facts in the realm of nature. No one disputes facts. It is the interpretation of the cause of facts and their bearing on life, religion and theology which is at the bottom of the confusion of thought to-day. The reader understands that fundamentally there are only two world-views: the Christian theistic and the mechanistic, naturalistic and practically atheistic. According to the former, the laws and forces of nature are but the instruments in God's hands for the realization of his purpose in the creation of the physical universe and of man; according to the latter, the universe is a vast self-originated, automatic, self-running mechanism.¹

We propose to inquire, with what facts or assumptions science, natural science, starts, how it reaches conclusions as to uniformity of natural law, the conservation of matter and energy, and the dictum of continuity in all stages of the history of the universe from the primitive nebula to plant and animal life up to man.

Science boasts that it starts with facts as over against philosophy and theology, which, it is alleged, start with mere ideas or concepts having no objective validity. Thus Professor R. A. Millikan, of the California Institute of Tech-

¹ John Burroughs writes: "It seems to me that there is no other adequate solution of the total problem of life and nature, than what is called pantheism, which identifies matter and mind, finite and infinite. . . . Shall we endow the Eternal with personality? Into what absurdities this leads us" (*Accepting the Universe*).

nology, writes: "The purport of science is to develop, without prejudice or preconception of any kind, a knowledge of the facts, the laws and the processes of nature." We propose to show that the affirmation that science proceeds "without prejudice or preconception of any kind" is false and that science, no less than philosophy and theology, starts with axioms, assumptions and postulates.²

The facts of the threefold revelation of God in nature, man and Scripture are, properly interpreted, in harmony and complementary. Hence, science, the truth derived from nature, the speculations of man on the universe, and theology, the universal science, or the doctrine of revelation concerning God, man and nature, go hand in hand. "Let us have a criticism of the categories of science, but let us avoid the dogmatism of asserting that the scientific unification of science has reached its limits" (J. A. Thomson, *The Bible and Nature*).

What Ministers Know of Science and Scientists of Theology.—It is unfortunate that the average scientist knows as much about theology as the average minister about science—not much. College professors of science and philosophy profess to teach science and philosophy pure and simple, without any religious or theological implications, and consider their obligations discharged when they explain the action of atoms, ions, electrons, of force or energy, of the constitution of the earth in its various geological strata, or describe the idealism of Plato, the pantheism of Spinoza, the panlogism of Hegel, or the evolutionary hypotheses of Darwin, Spencer, and others, meanwhile in many cases leaving

² An axiom is a self-evident or universally accepted truth, as two and two make four. An assumption is something taken for granted for the sake of argument. A postulate is "a demand that something be granted without proof," as the scientific assertion of the universality of natural law. "When you assume a premise without demonstrating it, . . . this is an assumption valid relatively . . . but not valid absolutely; if he [the learner] is reluctant or adverse, it is a postulate" (Grote's *Aristotle*). An hypothesis is a provisional conjecture, a proposition not proved, but assumed for argument.

on the mind of the student a somewhat cloudy impression of the significance of it all.

At the same time it is difficult for the scientist to refrain from observations on the origin of the world and the nature of matter, life, and spirit, questions of a distinctively philosophical and theological character. A number of years ago, the writer, while studying in the University of Chicago, heard a British scientist deliver a series of lectures on geology. He assured us at the outset that the course would be confined strictly to geology without trespassing on contiguous territory. As a matter of fact, nearly all of the last lecture was devoted to the elaboration of an altogether unique and one-sided hypothesis (anti-Biblical) of the origin of the universe, plants, animals and man. Even scientists present considered the whole procedure not only a breach of propriety, but an unwarranted attack on rival and possibly better supported hypotheses.

The average college graduate of recent years comes from his scientific and philosophical studies either with a half-digested system of truth and error, or often with a naturalistic, pantheistic trend and bias, though occasionally his early religious and Y. M. C. A. training and experience save him from the logical consequences of his science and philosophy.

A. ASSUMPTIONS AND PRESUPPOSITIONS OF SCIENCE

It is evident that there can be no progress in reasoning if every statement or proposition may be challenged. In order that men may reason at all, there must be one or more ultimate or fundamental truths which all alike accept as starting-points. Look at some of these presuppositions of science.

1. *Metaphysical Concepts.*—Science starts with a dozen assumptions that are purely metaphysical. Professor Alexander Winchell writes: "All the fundamental conceptions of science—self, substance, cause, force, life, order, law, purpose, relation, unity, identity, continuity, evolution, nat-

ural selection, species, genus, order, class—are purely metaphysical concepts” (quoted by Hoffman, *Sphere of Science*). Whenever we attempt to classify the data of science, we assume certain categories of thought and being. “The terms of science are conceptual formulæ. We talk glibly of matter, energy, ether, atoms and so on, but these are intellectual counters, rather than the realities themselves” (J. A. Thomson). “Science begins with abstractions and with every step in advance becomes more abstract. Reality is never found in a scientific system, except that the system as a mental construct is real” (G. A. Wilson, Syracuse Univ., in *Philosophical Review*, May, 1922).

2. *Systematized Facts*.—Science must start with inner facts before it can reach the facts of the outer world. I am more certain that I exist than that yonder tree exists. Before facts can be used scientifically they must be critically examined; they must be systematized facts. No mere accumulations of observations nor abstract theories constitute science. The alleged facts must be capable of verification or at least of verifiability. Mere individual experiences that could not be repeated by another have no place in science. “Most of the knowledge that the average man possesses is of little value for science, for the reason that it is of such a character that it cannot be reëxamined.” Such is the criticism to be made upon a great deal of modern thought—there is a lack of proof or desire for proof; and so, unproved assertion passes for truth or science.³

3. *Existence of the Self*.—Perhaps the first datum or fact upon which the scientist builds is his own existence. He does not stop to prove that he exists; he assumes this as a primary fact of consciousness. This consciousness of the

³ “The work of science is much more difficult of attainment than those who have not tried imagine, for things are not always what they seem. . . . First make sure of facts, but this is no easy matter. . . . Hypotheses are useful, but they have a tendency to put on the garb of full-grown theories, or even established doctrines” (J. A. Thomson, *Introduction to Science*).

self, the Ego, is an ultimate fact, and as an ultimate fact it is not susceptible of proof; if it were, it would not be an ultimate. From this it follows that the scientist can distinguish between himself and other objects; unless this be done, science is impossible. We are thus enabled to make the transition to the outer world.

4. *Validity of Laws of Thought*.—Every scientist presupposes the validity of the laws of thought. But we must distinguish between a law and a cause. A cause exerts some kind of force; but a law as such possesses no power to accomplish anything. Laws only tell us how a cause acts or is supposed to act. When we speak of physical law we refer to some observed way of physical energy. As no human being or any number of human beings can ever observe all the processes of nature, the so-called laws of nature must ever be viewed as more or less accurate formulations of truth. Remarking that no scientific law can be more than proximate, H. Poincaré writes: "When therefore a scientific theory pretends to teach us what heat is, or what is electricity, or light, it is condemned beforehand; all it can give us is a crude image. It is therefore provisional and crumbling. . . . To-day theories are born, to-morrow they are the fashion, the day after to-morrow they are classic, the fourth day they are superannuated and the fifth day they are forgotten" (*The Value of Science*).

5. *Assumption of Substance and Attributes*.—Not only the philosopher and the theologian, but the scientist, assume substances and their attributes. Every substance manifests attributes and it is by means of attributes that men seek to get back to the underlying substance. We study the phenomena of nature and mind and infer that there is mind, soul, personality, God. We examine the qualities of things with the view of establishing a theory of substance. If we discover attributes we conclude that they are attributes of something. Attributes would have no existence apart from the substance back of them. The scientist does not

pause to prove that such an object as a grain of wheat has substance and attributes; he assumes them, and he further assumes the identity of the substance with itself yesterday, to-day and to-morrow. If everything were in constant flux and flow, if nothing were static, according to Heraclitus and pragmatists, if everything were in constant change, there could be no definite conclusion as to anything, for we could not know that we were dealing with the same object.

6. *Universe in Space and Time.*—Every scientist assumes that the universe exists in space and time. We cannot think of a single event happening which does not take place in time or succession. With the Infinite the law of succession does not hold, for eternity is a category by itself. All things are ever present in the Infinite Mind. Nor can we think of motion without space. We assume the categories of length, breadth, thickness. All arithmetical and geometrical computation depends upon the predication of time and space; and all physical forces are computed in mathematical formulæ; in fact all such expressions as the law of gravitation, of chemical affinity, of light, and heat, would have no definite meaning if they could not be formulated in the precise terms of mathematics.

7. *Universe the Product of Mind.*—Another postulate is that the universe is the product of mind and not the result of chance. To be sure some scientists and speculators hold that the universe had no origin, but is an evolution from eternity through the agency of some unknown energy; but this view is pure assumption and exceptional; besides, scientists in general ignore it and take it for granted that, since it requires mind to discover the laws of nature, it required mind to ordain them. Law implies a lawgiver and the more intricate and profound the law, the wiser the lawgiver. Some hold that the universe exhibits mind, but that such mind is immanent and impersonal; but this is a contradiction in terms, for mind, if the term is to have a definite meaning, implies personality capable of distinguishing self

from other selves and things. The atom or electron has no such power. Hence an Eternal Person back of cosmic processes.

8. *Primary Data of Science Derived from Intuition.*—Before the scientist begins to classify and systematize, he must gather the necessary material, and this is done through the mind's connate power of thought and perception, supplemented by the evidence of the senses. "All sensations are results in consciousness that are immediately apprehended by the mind without any prior mental acts. The objects of the external world that we come to know through these sensations furnish the material for the physical scientist. And the immediate knowledge that the mind has of itself, and its acts and states, furnishes the elemental subject-matter of other departments of science" (Hoffman, *op. cit.*). Without entering upon the old discussion whether the greater half of knowledge comes from intuition or from sensation, we may remark that the scientist does not prove that he has a mind, certain intuitive powers of thought and observation, but proceeds at once to use them.

9. *Memory and Reflective Thought.*—The scientist also assumes that he has memory, and that it will serve him well. Even if man acquired the material of knowledge through sensation, it would be like a fleeing shadow unless he had the power of retaining it. Even if it were retained, it would be of little value, if it could not be reproduced and employed in new relations. "Without memory, observation and experiment can ascertain no fact, reasoning reach no conclusion, experience can accumulate no knowledge; for knowledge of this moment would vanish irrecoverably in the next."

But even acquiring and reproducing the objects of knowledge is not science, but acts of the mind preceding science. The scientist takes the facts reposing in consciousness and discerns more definitely what they signify. That is, he

seeks to bring the facts under general laws, and this alone constitutes science.⁴

B. THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD

We hear much of the superiority of the scientific method as compared with the method of theology. What is the scientific method? Is it a totally new instrument of acquiring truth, or is it an old method somewhat modified?

Since the time of Aristotle, there have been two chief methods of science, the deductive and the inductive, or the *a priori* and the *a posteriori*. In the deductive method we argue from the general to the particular, in the inductive, from the particular to the general. "However useful may be empirical knowledge, it is yet of slight importance compared with the well-connected and perfectly explained body of knowledge which constitutes an advanced and deductive science. It is in fact in proportion as a science becomes deductive and enables us to grasp more and more apparently unconnected facts under the same law that it becomes perfect" (Jevons, *Principles of Science*).

1. *The Syllogism*.—All true reasoning consists of three parts: the major premise, the minor premise and the conclusion, together constituting a syllogism, either formally expressed or implied. As a matter of fact the three parts of a syllogism are rarely expressed in so many words in the actual affairs of life; but they are implied in such a simple statement as "John Smith is mortal," which is equivalent to saying: all men are mortal; John Smith is a man: there-

⁴ Professor John Dewey, the pragmatist, writes: "If a scientific man be asked what is truth, he will reply—if he frame his reply in terms of his practice and not of convention—that which is accepted upon adequate evidence. And if he be asked for a description of adequacy of evidence, he certainly will refer to matters of observation and experiment" (*Essays in Experimental Logic*, p. 63). But see note from Pillsbury below. Sir Oliver Lodge deplores the tendency of science "to take refuge in rather vague forms of statement, and to shrink from closer examination of the puzzling and the obscure" (*Continuity*, p. 111).

fore John Smith is mortal. The cheap wit of half-educated persons about the uselessness of the syllogism is at the bottom of not a little false reasoning. "The major premise of a deductive syllogism may be a universal principle like an axiom in mathematics, or a generalization from concrete facts, but in either case the way of reasoning about it is the type of all reasoning" (Jevons).⁵

2. *Relation of Induction and Deduction.*—The relation of induction and deduction may be stated thus: "In a certain sense all knowledge is inductive. We can learn the laws and relations of things in nature only by observing those things. But the knowledge gained from the senses relates to particular facts, and we require some process by which we may ascertain the law or laws governing them. . . . All reasoning rests ultimately upon the principles of deduction. This is often overlooked. . . . I call in question the existence of any method of reasoning which can be carried on without a knowledge of deductive processes. There is no mode of ascertaining the laws which are obeyed in certain phenomena, unless we have the power of determining what results would follow from a given law. . . . A person who enters a labyrinth must either trust to chance to lead him out, or he must carefully notice the road by which he entered. The facts of experience are a labyrinth of particular results; we might by chance observe the law, but this is scarcely possible unless we thoroughly learn the effects which would attach to any particular law" (Jevons). "All fact is theorized fact. Of fact entirely free from theory we

⁵The word logic is used in a wide and a narrow sense. It is "either the science which directs the operations of the mind in the attainment of truth, or the science which treats of the conceptual representations of the real order" (Joyce, *Principles of Logic*). The former is the kind usually studied in college; it does not aim to go back of the phenomenal order of things. It accepts them at their face value. The latter kind inquires into the correctness and legitimacy of the conceptions formed of the real world back of the phenomenal order. Such is the aim of the Hegelian logic which would identify the world of thought and the world of reality on the principle that the real is the rational and the rational the real.

have no experience; we can speak of it in words, but can form no conception of it. Recognized fact is classified facts" (A. Sidgwick, *The Application of Logic*, p. 231).

3. *What is Induction?*—It is the legitimate inference of universal laws from individual cases. Here is a problem for solution. Experience is limited to a comparatively small number of individual cases. Why are we warranted in saying that "diamonds are combustible," when not all diamonds have been examined? The principle is, that when we have discovered the precise quality which produces a certain effect, this quality will always have the same result. Here the pragmatic view that nothing is static or permanent breaks down utterly. The pragmatist must allow that the quality of the diamond is stable, or he is unable to establish the law of combustibility.

The reader will note that here again science resorts to logic and metaphysics. The process by which we reach the conclusion that diamonds are combustible is purely abstract and a generalization from particulars. The diamonds examined stand for all diamonds, represent a class, that is, universal concepts.⁶

4. *Difficulty of Induction.*—The discovery of universal laws is an exceedingly long and tedious process. "The circumstances which affect the operation of natural causes are so multifarious and their accurate determination surrounded by so many difficulties that the progress of human knowledge is slow" (Joyce). The great question in regard to induction is, When are we warranted in taking some

⁶ "A philosophy of science is growing increasingly necessary. . . . Owing to increasing specializations, and to the constantly accelerated accumulation of facts, the general bearings of scientific systems become more and more lost to view, and the synthesis that depends on coexistence of multifarious knowledge in a single mind becomes increasingly difficult." So writes Bertrand Russell in the Preface to H. Poincaré's *Science and Method*. Russell regards a philosophy of science especially useful at present on account of the sweeping away of old landmarks through provisional hypotheses and revolutionary and 'evolutionary' methods, even the Newtonian dynamics being "now regarded as doubtful."

instances that have come under our notice, as accurate representatives of a whole class? It is an inductive conclusion that all planets move in an elliptical orbit. How do we reach this conclusion, since only a limited number of planets have been observed? The only way of reaching a satisfactory conclusion is by falling back on a mathematical and mechanical law. "When it was ascertained that the centripetal and centrifugal forces act jointly on all planets and that the product of this joint action is an elliptical orbit, then the conclusion was indisputable that all planets, observed and unobserved, move in elliptical orbits" (Atwater, *Logic*). In other words it must be shown that the series in question comes under some universal law, that is, is an *a priori* truth.⁷

C. THE UNIFORMITY OF NATURE

We are constantly told that science proceeds on the assumption of the correctness of the principle of the absolute uniformity of nature. By what train of reasoning do we reach such a law? How do we know that nature is uniform, the whole of nature throughout the universe? Whence does science get such a law? Is it in the assumption that the universe is a closed system? or, that the universe is fatalistically determined? Or, has God once for all ordained laws and then deistically withdrawn from all control of such laws? The legitimacy of such law must be examined. The principle refers exclusively to the physical universe and accordingly can have no higher degree of necessity than belongs to the constitution of the natural order. We must suppose that the Power which established the laws can suspend or supersede them, if for any reason deemed

⁷ "An idea, if it is a real idea, is always a type. It is made a type by the context in which it stands and by the fact that it has developed out of a mass of experiences, not from one alone. . . . Inductions are never complete and so in strictness prove nothing. . . . Most of the proof in induction comes not from the particular as particular; the real value of the instance is as a type, as the expression of a previously established law or principle" (Pillsbury, *The Psychology of Reasoning*, pp. 201-238).

wise. This distinction may be expressed by saying that the principle of uniformity is *physically*, not *metaphysically* necessary.

1. *The Uniformity of Nature as Physically Necessary.*—All effects are due to some cause. Every agent, moreover, acts according to its own nature and can act in no other way. "Unless an agent possesses free-will it must act in a manner not merely in accordance with its nature, but absolutely prescribed by that nature. . . . The action involves a relation to the object acted on, and hence depends not merely on the agent, but on the patient. Thus the very concept of a natural agent devoid of free-will involves that under the same circumstances its action will be of the same kind. In other words the uniformity of nature is an analytic judgment" (Joyce). The phrase is equivalent to saying, nature is nature, or nature is of one and the same form, that is, there is no more in the predicate than in the subject.

2. *The Limits of Physical Necessity.*—Here we enter the field back of nature and its laws. We cannot stop with nature as such and assume it to be an or the *ultimate* in and for itself without accepting the philosophy of naturalism, energetic monism or pantheism in one form or another. If, as theists, and above all, Christian theists, we believe in a great First Cause who is a person, we are logically driven to the conclusion that God subordinates the laws of nature to some wise end and is not fatalistically compelled to carry out without possibility of variation the laws of his own ordaining. The very notion of a First Cause involves as its consequence that he is not merely the cause of things, but that he continually sustains them in being. Their persistence in being is in fact a continuous providence.

3. *Law and Contingency.*—God as Creator and ordainer is the unity and source of freedom. If scientists allow that God had any part in the origination of the universe, they must allow the possibility, indeed the probability, of his intervention in case human folly threatens to thwart his

plan. Freedom is ever grounded in the right use of intelligence; science, however, bound by its iron-clad law of continuity and necessity, has no room for the freedom of God, and yet by a palpable absurdity every scientist not a determinist (and we have a list of quite a number of determinists) regards himself as self-determined. "As to the regularity of nature or the universal reign of law, this never can be empirically established, nor does its denial involve any contradiction: that is to say, it is neither demonstrable nor axiomatic" (J. Ward, *The Realm of Ends*, p. 12). Ward, a spiritualistic monist, is convinced that "mechanism is not the secret of the universe; that, if it is to have any meaning, it must subserve some end."

4. *Possibility of God Intervening in the Laws of Nature.*

—Science holds that interference with natural law is equivalent to denying the stability of the universe.⁸ The objection has weight, if we conceive of God as arbitrarily changing nature's laws. Such view is inconceivable. Any modification must be regarded as the entrance of a higher law in order to attain the supreme purpose. "It is one thing to own that occasionally God does in fact suspend his own laws, when the striking manifestation of his power may be for man's good. It is a very different thing to hold that a capricious suspension of law is at any moment likely to occur" (Joyce).

The chief reason why scientists and some modernists question fundamental Christian tenets is that, if God were to intervene in nature or human history, the postulate of the invariability of natural law would be endangered. Therefore, before any progress can be made the issue must be decided.

⁸ The absurdity of the claim is evident from the fact that when I pick up an object from the floor, I do indeed interfere with the law of gravity and in fact perform a *relatively supernatural act, super naturam*, that is, an act above and higher than nature and for a desired end. I doubt whether my act interferes with the stability of the universe; am disposed to think that thereby a higher purpose is attained.

5. *Why Naturalism Denies Divine Intervention.*—According to naturalism, represented by Spinoza, Mill, Hæckel, positivistic and pragmatic schools, "the monism of the cosmos . . . proclaims the absolute domination of the great iron laws throughout the universe. It thus shatters, at the same time, the three central dogmas of the dualistic philosophy—the personality of God, the immortality of the soul and the freedom of the will" (Hæckel, *Riddle of the Universe*). Hæckel's atheism, though so repellant that most scientists profess to reject it (*e.g.*, Osborn, Conklin, Patten, Millikan), is at bottom the logical result of the postulates of contemporaneous science. Few scientists venture to come forward with a clear-cut, intelligible theory of the manner in which they reconcile their major premise with Christian theism. Their conception of natural law leaves no room for the God of Scripture.

6. *The Christian Theistic Formulation of Natural Law.*—Every law as long as it is a law is in the nature of the case invariable, that is, as long as the conditions are the same. Otherwise it would not be a law. In this sense uniformity is indispensable. Law not being an entity, but the expression of will, is subject to change, if the will, or rather the person ordering it, should in wisdom and for a supreme end introduce a higher law. The uniformity of natural law is not of such a character as to forbid our holding that God may in great crises modify the forces of nature. God certainly is not the slave of the laws that he ordained. The only question is, What such crises are or may be. "The uniformity of nature, of which many make a very fetish, is itself an expression of wisdom and love" and so may be changed, if need arise. The uniformity of nature is decreed, not by blind force, but by supreme wisdom, as the glory of God and the welfare of man demand. Miracles are, therefore, rational, credible and necessary. Since the laws of nature have no existence apart from God, they are never "broken," but merely "repaired" or "amended" from time to time.

7. *Ethical Necessity*.—There is a higher than physical law and necessity, namely, a moral, ethical, metaphysical, mediatorial necessity. Beyond the physical we must under any consistent Christian view predicate a Being who will attain his purpose in nature and grace despite the apparently irrevocable laws of nature.

8. *John Stuart Mill on the Uniformity of Nature*.—John Stuart Mill was the logician who devoted most attention to a consideration of the reasons which lead scientists generally to accept the rule that nature is absolutely uniform. Unless we adopt this rule, science, he affirms, is impossible. But as Mill was not an intellectualist, nor idealist in philosophy, but an empiricist, he is barred from falling back on *a priori* principles and must depend on experimentation or empiricism.

Mill does not use the term cause, causation, in the usual sense, but understands by it mere succession or antecedence in time. The whole process is a succession in time; a before and after. The cause does not exert any influence on the effect, he affirms. A cause in short is the same as a condition. "The cause, philosophically speaking, is the sum total of the conditions, positive and negative taken together" (*Logic*).

9. *Comment on Mill's View*.—To regard causality as a mere time relation is contrary to all experience. A thing which begins to exist cannot possibly have its existence from itself, although this is the uniform teaching of the current evolutionism; it cannot be self-created; it must derive existence from something else. Every thing that comes into existence must have, not a mere existence in time, but an efficient cause which is the reason why it exists. The Great Uncaused is the sole exception. Mill's identification of cause and condition is fundamentally false. He holds that we must be cognizant of the *unconditional* character of the connection, *i.e.*, that it will take place inevitably. But if we are able to affirm that the connection is *unconditional*,

70 *Scientific, Philosophical, and Theological Faith*

we must have proof of some relation of the consequent to the antecedent. But this implies something more than mere sequence.

10. *Mill's Account of the Principle of Induction.*—Mill's empirical philosophy cuts the ground from underneath his feet. He has no solid footing. He cannot appeal to the nature of things, for there is no such thing in his philosophy. The Uniformity of nature, he admits, is itself discovered "by the loose and uncertain method of simple enumeration." Since human experience extends at most only over a few thousand years, and since the records are fragmentary and uncertain, how do we know that there may not be some exceptions to uniformity, as in the case of the resurrection of Christ? In fact Mill himself allowed that he found no reason why the law should hold good "in distant parts of the stellar universe."

D. NO PROOF OF UNIFORMITY, SAY PROMINENT LOGICIANS

Later logicians of the empirical school abandon all attempts to prove this principle. Bain writes: "We can give no evidence for this uniformity." Huxley: "The one act of faith in the convert to science is the confession of the invariability of order and of the absolute validity, in all times and at all places, of this law of causation." Even Darwin says: "This confession is an act of faith, because from the nature of the case, the truth of such propositions is not susceptible of proof" (*Life*, II, 200).

Jevons writes: "We have heard much of what has been called the Reign of Law, and the necessity and uniformity of natural forces has been not uncommonly interpreted as involving the non-existence of an intelligent and benevolent Power, capable of interfering with the course of natural events. . . . It seemed to be not out of place in a work on Scientific Method to allude to the ultimate results and limits of that method. I fear that I have very imperfectly suc-

ceeded in expressing my strong conviction that before a rigorous logical scrutiny, the *Reign of Law will prove to be an unverified hypothesis, the uniformity of nature an ambiguous expression, the certainty of our scientific inferences to a great extent a delusion.*"

This stinging reproof from the celebrated professor of logic in University College, London, ought to cause men to look sharply into the logic and epistemology of science and a false evolutionism before swallowing everything that passes for a New Gospel. Jevons adds: "The value of science is of course very high, while the conclusions are kept well within the limits of the data on which they are founded, but it is pointed out that our experience is of the most limited character compared with what there is to learn, while our mental powers seem to fall infinitely short of the task of comprehending and explaining fully the nature of any one object."

Karl Pearson's Critique of Scientific Method.—Some false views regarding scientific method are cogently exposed by Karl Pearson in his great work, *The Grammar of Science*: "What are we to say with regard to scientific law? Does it really exist before man has given expression to it? Has the word any meaning when unassociated with the mind of man? I hold that we must definitely answer 'no.' . . . A scientific law is related to the perception and conception formed by the perceptive and reasoning faculties in man; it is meaningless except in association with these; it is a *résumé* or brief *expression* of the relationships and sequences of certain groups of these perceptions and conceptions, and exists only when formulated by man. . . . There is more meaning in the statement that man gives laws to nature than in the converse that nature gives laws to man" (*op. cit.*, pp. 82, 86).⁹

⁹ Pearson adds: "How idle it is, then, to speak of the law of gravitation, or indeed of any scientific law, as ruling nature. Such laws simply *describe*, they never *explain*, the routine of our perceptions, the sense-impressions we project into an *outside world*."

72 *Scientific, Philosophical, and Theological Faith*

In short, to adopt the principle of the invariability of natural law is to renounce the hope of finding any secure basis for physical science. Well might Bain speak of it as a "leap in the dark." Scientists may not reproach theologians for starting with faith, for both proceed in a similar way. Indeed science with its empirical, often pragmatic, and behavioristic philosophy as over against the intuitional, has less justification for such a course than theology.¹⁰

¹⁰ The transition is easy from faith in the *theological* sense of "a spiritual perception of the invisible objects of religion" to that of *science* as "assent to the truth of a proposition for which there is not complete evidence."

DAYTON, OHIO.

V

THE UNITED CHURCH OF CANADA, OR THE UNION OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN CANADA, THE METHODIST CHURCH AND THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES

RUFUS W. MILLER

The United Church of Canada, representing the Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational Churches, comes into formal being on the Tenth day of June, 1925, by an Act of Incorporation of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada.

The history of this movement is interesting. The negotiations carried on from 1903 to 1908, looking to an organic union of the Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational Churches in the Dominion of Canada, had their origin in the efforts that were put forth during the years 1899-1903 to prevent, as far as possible, any unseemly rivalry and any waste of men and means in the mission work which was being carried on by these different Churches, especially in the newer districts of the country.

In 1902 the General Conference of the Methodist Church proposed a measure of Organic Union for all Evangelical Churches in Canada. Invitations were accepted to consider a basis of union by the Methodist, Presbyterian and Congregational Churches.

The basis of union was prepared by a Joint Committee of the three Churches. Afterwards it was considered, analyzed and revised by the denominational sections meeting separately and again considered, amended and finally endorsed by the Joint Committee, in full session.

The work of drawing up the basis of union extended over

a period of five years and a Joint Committee finally approved it in December, 1908.

The basis of union was submitted, through the supreme governing or advisory bodies of the respective Churches, to the Presbyteries, Conferences and Associations and adopted by them in a constitutional manner. In addition, the members of the several congregations were consulted and voted in favor of the proposed union, although this was not required under the constitution, for instance, of the Presbyterian Church.

In the case of the Presbyterian Church the General Assembly first decided to consummate the union in 1916. The Union Committee was instructed to obtain legal advice for the drawing up of the necessary legislation in conjunction with the Committees of the other Churches. Legislative action was deferred because of the war and anxieties relating to the war.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church delayed final action in view of the extent of the minority vote which was taken by the congregations. First by the vote of officials and second by vote of communicants and third by the vote of adherents, but the vote was overwhelmingly in favor of Union and so also in the case of the Methodist and Congregational Churches.

The Act incorporating the United Church of Canada was approved July 19, 1924. It is interesting to note the Preamble of this Act, which is as follows:

WHEREAS, the Presbyterian Church in Canada, the Methodist Church and the Congregational Churches of Canada have by their petition represented that,

Believing the promotion of Christian Unity to be in accordance with the divine Will, they recognize the obligation to seek and promote Union with other Churches, adhering to the same fundamental principles of the Christian faith, and

THAT, Having the right to unite to one another without loss of their identity, upon terms which they find to be

consistent with such principles, they have adopted a Basis of Union and have agreed to unite and form one body or denomination of Christians under the name of THE UNITED CHURCH OF CANADA.

The historical background previous to this formal effort toward union of these three great bodies is suggestive. Canadian Christians have had long training. The first settlers came from Scotland where there were many divisions and they carried their divisions and prejudices with them. The first Presbytery was organized in 1786; known as "The Burgher Presbytery of Truro." In 1795 "The Anti-Burgher Presbytery of Pictou" was organized.

The difference between these two illustrates the subtlety of the Scottish mind and how political distinctions affected religious life. There was in Scotland a State Church controlled by the State and supported by state funds. There were certain incorporated Burghs or cities and each citizen had to take an oath pledging himself to have nothing to do with the Church of Rome and to support the Protestant religion before he could become a Burgher and have a vote. One party in the Secession Church interpreted the oath as involving approval of the State Church of Scotland, of which they could not approve and so declined to take the oath, and then became "Anti-Burghers" and organized a separate Presbytery.

Into Canada this ancient division was imported and persisted in, although neither State Church, nor incorporated burgh, nor oath was known. But there did exist a great need of coöperation amongst a new and scattered population. Negotiations began and it took twenty years and, finally, the United Presbyterian Synod was organized consisting of the two Presbyteries—Burgher and Anti-Burgher—together with three ministers of the Church of Scotland and two Congregational ministers. This was in 1817, and three years later, in 1820, a somewhat similar Methodist Union followed. Into the two provinces, then known as

Upper and Lower Canada, now known as Ontario and Quebec, two streams of Methodism had flowed—the Methodist Episcopal of the United States and the British Wesleyans of England.

After prolonged negotiations it was decided that all the Methodists in Quebec should unite with the British Methodists and all in Ontario under the Methodist Episcopal and that they should respect each other's territory.

Thus as the population grew and mission interests became more pressing, union succeeded union so that the Presbyterian Church in Canada of to-day is itself the result of nine different unions, the last of which was in 1875.

In addition to these nine there were seven absorptions of formerly independent bodies which, without formal negotiations, came into the united body as independent congregations.

The existing Methodist Church in Canada is the result of eight unions, in which sixteen different bodies are included. Similarly, the Congregational Churches are the outcome of a succession of unions, the last having taken place in 1907. Thus, in Canada, the spirit of Church Union might be said to be in the blood and what is now transpiring is but a further development along familiar lines. The fathers were not lacking in reverence for the past, nor in affection for old associations, but their ideals of what the Church of Christ ought to be made them willing to sacrifice sentiment to that end. Doubtless in the past there were heart-burnings and animated discussions and separations at every stage of the process, but as time passed these separations were healed and antagonisms forgotten and the result justified all that has been done.

The rapid expansion of these great denominations in the last fifty years at home and abroad, whilst gratifying in itself, did not prove adequate to the need. Canada's development in the twentieth century gives promise of becoming what the United States development attained in the nine-

teenth century. The tide of population in Canada began to rise rapidly at the same time that the Orient was awakened. The appeals from Home and Foreign Mission fields were so insistent that the new situation was accepted as a challenge to wider unions with a view to greater efficiency. The experience of former unions encouraged the expectation that larger results would follow.

CONSERVING ELEMENTS OF STRENGTH

The basis of Union, it may well be believed, conserves the elements of strength in each of the three denominations. A reading of the doctrinal basis of union indicates that the task of facing a common basis of doctrine has not been so difficult as the theological controversies of the past might have predicted. The leading of the divine Spirit, the growth of an interdenominational literature, the use of the same familiar hymns and perhaps, above all, the pressure of a great common task, the evangelization of the world, have dissolved the old antagonisms and permitted a general unity of thought. Even the formidable disputes between Calvinist and Arminian which once surged around the sovereignty and purpose of God may be said to be laid to rest in the happy confession of this basis:

We believe that the eternal, wise, holy and loving purpose of God embraces all events, so that while the freedom of man is not taken away, nor is God the author of sin, yet in His providence He makes all things work together in the fulfilment of His sovereign design and manifestation of His glory.

The polity or form of government proposed for the United Church observes two great principles—LIBERTY and EFFICIENT COÖPERATION. To existing congregations when they enter the Union the utmost liberty will be given in the management of their domestic affairs in so far as that is compatible with the exercise of the higher courts with their powers and functions. Property rights of existing charges will not be affected without their consent. Efficient coöp-

eration is secured by a system of government that preserves all the essentials of the differing polities of the uniting Churches. All charges to be formed after the union will have a Session, a Committee of Stewards and an Official Board. The members of the Session will doubtless be called Elders for the Basis of Union speaks of them as "A body of men especially chosen and set apart or ordained to have oversight of the spiritual interest of charges." The Stewards manage the financial affairs. The Official Board, consisting of the Session and Committee of Stewards, secures contributions for missionary and other purposes, makes representations concerning the pastoral relation to the Settlement Committee and selects representatives in full membership to Presbytery. The Presbytery is composed of the ministers and representatives of charges and these representatives are to be equal in number to the ministers. Its duties are identical with the present Presbytery except in the matter of the ordination and settlement of the ministry.

While the Presbytery will be informed and will have the opportunity to review and to pass an opinion upon all matters relating to a minister, the settlement of a minister and final right of ordination and settlement rests with the next higher court, the Conference and its Settlement Committee.

The Conference, like the existing Synods, consists of all representatives and ministers of charges within bounds. Its duties and powers are similar to those of the Synod except that upon the Conference rests the duty of striving to provide every charge with a pastor and every effective pastor with a charge. This involves the reception, ordination and settlement of ministers. The settlement is effected through a Settlement Committee which receives applications for settlement and consults ministers and congregations.

The highest court of all, The General Council, meets every other year. Its powers and duties are similar to those of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church and the General Synod of our Reformed Church. The General

Council has full power to legislate on all matters respecting doctrine, worship, membership and government of the Church, subject to the condition: That before any rule or law relative to these matters can become a permanent law, it must receive the approval of a majority of the Presbyteries, and, if advisable, of pastoral charges.

The Settlement Committee planned for the ministry is interesting. It seeks to embody what the experience of the negotiating Churches has proved to be beneficial and to eliminate objectionable features which have long been a source of humiliation and vexation. The rights of a people to extend a call to the man of their choice are maintained but if, as sometimes happens, too much time is lost in securing a settlement by regular call, the Conference or the Presbytery claims the right, in the interests of the whole Church, to settle a minister in a congregation.

By the new arrangement the Methodist Church gives up the itineracy and gives more place to the voice of the people in a choice of their pastor.

The Article on the Ministry in the "Basis of Union" sets forth the plan of the Settlement Committee of the Conference consisting of ministers and laymen, and appointed annually by the Conference. On this Committee each Presbytery is represented.

It is the duty of this Committee to consider all applications for settlement from ministers and pastoral charges within the district over which it has jurisdiction. For this purpose it meets annually before the meeting of the Conference next after that by which it was appointed. The minister by his own action and the pastoral charge through its constitutional representatives may, by such a date before the annual meeting of the Settlement Committee as the General Council shall determine, seek a change of pastoral relation by means of an application through the Presbytery to the Settlement Committee. All such applications shall be in writing. The Settlement Committee is authorized to

initiate correspondence with ministers and pastoral charges with a view to completing arrangements for a necessary and desirable settlement. Provision is also made for a Committee, for the transfer of ministers from one Conference to another.

The Basis of Union does seem to suggest an improvement over the present lack of system where everything is left to individual action. It provides for necessary change through the annual opportunity of an honorable transfer while keeping the permanent pastorate as the ideal to be worked out where conditions are favorable. Under this system, where minister and people both desire it, the pastoral relation may continue for a lifetime, but at the end of any Conference year either pastor or people may seek a change. This request passes to the Conference Committee through the Presbytery which may confer with the parties and then the change, if still desired, can be effected without reflection upon either pastor or people. This leaves no charge pastorless and no effective minister without a charge. Charges about to be vacant are free to call and ministers are free to accept, and, "while the right of appointment is to rest with the Settlement Committee, it is to comply as far as possible with the wishes of ministers and charges." This surely provides a worthy working basis which may be improved upon as the experience of the United Church reveals defects and suggests remedies.

On matters of doctrine or creeds, it may be said that the Basis of Union adopted by the negotiating Churches agrees on the essentials of faith and recognizes that there is room for freedom of thought. It is not a surrender on the part of any one of the denominations or of any particular faith but the carrying of the beliefs and principles into a United Church where they will become vital in a larger way.

The doctrinal basis is simple and scriptural. "We acknowledge," it is said in the preamble, "the teaching of the great creeds of the Ancient Church." The Trinity and the

Divinity of Christ are as firmly held as ever. The twenty articles center about the person of Christ and His redemptive work. The new emphasis which has come with the Church's awakening to large responsibilities reveals itself in several touches. We are "Chosen in Christ unto holiness, service and salvation." The closing article, new in ecclesiastical creeds, gives more adequate expression than ever before to the loud call to missionary and social activities, so characteristic of our times. Nor will those whose mystic natures have drawn them to the inner life in Christ fail to find sympathy in this brief but comprehensive statement. They will be pleased with the importance accorded to the work of the Holy Spirit and with the recognition of "a conscious assurance of their sonship."

This union emphasizes the unity of the Church and undoubtedly means increased efficiency, economy and a larger liberty of the Children of God. The question of organic union may be argued from the point of economy or from that of efficiency but underlying all such arguments is the religious principle which presents the union of separate denominations in one Church not merely as a matter of expediency but of duty. The alternative lies between growing together of various communions in a united Church or their perpetuation under a separate confession as denominations. Which line of action carries out most completely the command of the Spirit as expressed in Scripture and in history? When we turn to the New Testament we find one unvarying idea of the Church—the fellowship of believers in which they have communion with the loving Lord as their Head and with one another as brethren. This fellowship is essentially a unity. It exists to express and maintain in one organic life the great unities of religion—of one body, one spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one Kingdom, one God and Father of all. The New Testament knows nothing of denominations.

When we come to the Reformation we might perhaps

expect the recognition and justification of separate denominations. This, however, we do not find. The Reformers separated themselves from the Papacy but not from the Catholic Church. The ideal of the Reformers was that of the particular Church in each nation which should represent for that people a universal Church. All these particular Churches should enjoy full intercommunion of members and a complete mutual recognition of each other's ministerial orders. "Christianity," it has been said in a memorable phrase, "can conquer only by its whole magnitude." A movement like the United Church of Canada is a splendid answer towards Christian Church Unity. This specific union is part of a general union throughout Protestant Christendom. As the Churches of Canada—this land of the wider spaces and the freer life—were used of God to lead the way in the matter of reunion within denominations which in the older lands had broken apart, so now again the eyes of the world are upon Canada and it seems as though God were honoring the Canadian Churches once more by thus showing them how to lead the way in union between denominations of distinct historical origin.

The value of this union from the standpoint of efficiency and economy is demonstrated by the first fruits of the consideration of the plan of union. In twelve hundred communities local union of overlapping Churches is an accomplished fact. This has saved men and money and has put the Church in the place of effective leadership because it has freed itself from petty rivalries and divisions which were the chief hindrances to successful community activity. The minister is no longer the leader of two or three communities but a religious leader in one for which his Church alone is responsible. Not only is there the saving of men, the saving of missionary funds in places where aid-receiving charges become self-supporting, but the Church itself is more effective. In the interests of a virile country life, Church Union is a necessity.

From the standpoint of Foreign Missions the cry rises from every foreign mission land in favor of Church Union. At the Shanghai National Missionary Conference held in May, 1922, a Commission, on which not a single missionary acted as a member, voiced the dominant regret of the indigenous Church that Chinese Christians found themselves divided, not through misunderstandings, debates or disruptions among themselves, but through denominationalism imported from the West. The Commission at the Shanghai Conference reported in these terms:

We firmly believe that it is only the United Church that can save China for our task is great and enough strength can only be obtained through solid unity.

THEREFORE, In the name of the Lord who prayed that all may be one, we appeal to all those who love the same Lord to follow His command and be united into one Church, catholic and indivisible, for the salvation of China.

The Churches of Canada believe that the growing needs of the Foreign field are an added justification for the Union Movement.

This United Church of Canada will carry over into the Union through the three distinct bodies all of the Congregational and all of the Methodist Church and practically all of the Presbyterian Churches. Some of the congregations of the Presbyterian Church, especially in Montreal, will probably remain out of the Union for the time being.

The United Church will become the leading Protestant force in the Dominion. The statistics of these three Churches are about as shown in table on page 94.

Finally it may be said that the union of these Churches in Canada stands for liberty of thought. The soul of man was born for freedom. Where the spirit of the Lord is there is liberty: "If ye continue in my word then are ye my disciples indeed. Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make ye free." This is a lesson hard to learn. The persecutions of Rome, Switzerland, Scotland, were but manifestations of the same ambition to crush individuality and

compel submission to the will and behest of another. The same spirit quickly appeared among the Puritans in America, and in our ancestors in Pennsylvania. The same spirit appears in the antagonisms known as Fundamentalists and Modernists amongst the Churches to-day but the unity for which our Lord prayed is not to be won in that way. The very spirit of democracy of our times emphasizes the rights and privileges of every man to think for himself. None dare make him afraid. Inscribed on the archways of the Columbian Exhibition was the sentence—"Toleration in religion, the best fruit of the last four centuries."

	Congregational	Methodist	Presbyterian
Population of Canada, Census of 1921 (about 9,000,000)	30,574	1,158,744	1,408,812
Communicants (1922)	12,762	407,264	369,938
Sunday School force	11,132	470,904	392,942
Total givings to all purposes	329,821	9,209,276	9,187,512
Ministers' stipends, exclusive of residence, and Mission grants	113,000	2,520,282	2,768,150
Women's Missionary Society income	15,145	457,707	435,008
Real estate values	2,189,000	57,067,429	40,000,000
Debts on properties	(not given)	3,761,739	4,075,461
College endowments	138,065	2,819,437	1,623,184
Aged and infirm ministers funds, endowments	113,115	2,278,477	1,919,317
Mission reserve and trust funds, including W. M. S.	261,739	675,496	725,573

The multiplication of divisions in the Churches is oftentimes a protest against the spirit of compulsion. The presence of four or six struggling congregations of different communions in a village which could be amply served by one—whilst a pitiful spectacle from the standpoint of economy and efficiency, yet, on the other hand, is a declaration of independence of a man's right to follow in matters spiritual the inclination of his own heart and mind.

When will we come to see that the highest ideal of human development is not in all men thinking the same thoughts nor speaking the same words: it is rather in freedom of expression of the inner life, allowing for variety

and color characteristic of the life of God within the soul. How then, amid such freedom of thought, can unity exist? The answer in Canada is that it consists in such coördination of all the agencies and functions of the Church as exist in coördination of all the complexities of the human body. The foot cannot say to the hand, I have no need of thee; nor the ear to the eye, I have no need of thee. There are diversities of gifts but the same spirit. There are diversities of opinion but it is the same God who worketh in all. He is the God of freedom and action. He giveth the word of wisdom to one; to another the word of knowledge, to another the gifts of healing, to another the working of miracles, but to all, the working of that self-same spirit providing to every man severally as he will. Is not that a glorious conception of the living Church? An organization of unity in variety and variety in unity. "That, speaking the truth in love, we may grow up into Him in all things who is the Head, even Christ, from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love."

The Canadian basis of Union agrees on the essentials of faith and recognizes that in all non-essentials there is fullest freedom and love. When will, at least, the families of the Churches in the United States see the needs of Christendom and do their duty by uniting together? We give herewith the Basis of Union as agreed upon by the Joint Committee of the Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational Churches and as approved by the several bodies and as presented by an Act of Incorporation.¹

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

¹ See pages 86-111 of this issue.

THE UNITED CHURCH OF CANADA

THE BASIS OF UNION

AS AGREED UPON BY THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE PRES-
BYTERIAN, METHODIST AND CONGREGATIONAL
CHURCHES

GENERAL

1. The name of the Church formed by the union of the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches in Canada shall be "The United Church of Canada."

2. It shall be the policy of The United Church to foster the spirit of unity in the hope that this sentiment of unity may in due time, so far as Canada is concerned, take shape in a church which may fittingly be described as national.

DOCTRINE

We, the representatives of the Presbyterian, the Methodist, and the Congregational branches of the Church of Christ in Canada, do hereby set forth the substance of the Christian faith, as commonly held among us. In doing so, we build upon the foundation laid by the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone. We affirm our belief in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the primary source and ultimate standard of Christian faith and life. We acknowledge the teaching of the great creeds of the ancient Church. We further maintain our allegiance to the evangelical doctrines of the Reformation, as set forth in common in the doctrinal standards adopted by the Presbyterian Church in Canada, by the Congregational Union of Ontario and Quebec, and by the Methodist Church. We present the accompanying statement as a brief summary of our common faith and commend it to the studious attention of the members and adherents of the negotiating Churches, as in substance agreeable to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures.

ARTICLE I.—*Of God.*—We believe in the one only living

and true God, a Spirit, infinite, eternal and unchangeable, in His being and perfections; the Lord Almighty, who is love, most just in all His ways, most glorious in holiness, unsearchable in wisdom, plenteous in mercy, full of compassion, and abundant in goodness and truth. We worship Him in the unity of the Godhead and the mystery of the Holy Trinity, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, three persons of the same substance, equal in power and glory.

ARTICLE II.—*Of Revelation.*—We believe that God has revealed Himself in nature, in history, and in the heart of man; that He has been graciously pleased to make clearer revelation of Himself to men of God who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit; and that in the fulness of time He has perfectly revealed Himself in Jesus Christ, the Word made flesh, who is the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of His person. We receive the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, given by inspiration of God, as containing the only infallible rule of faith and life, a faithful record of God's gracious revelations, and as the sure witness to Christ.

ARTICLE III.—*Of the Divine Purpose.*—We believe that the eternal, wise, holy and loving purpose of God so embraces all events that while the freedom of man is not taken away, nor is God the author of sin, yet in His providence He makes all things work together in the fulfilment of His sovereign design and the manifestation of His glory.

ARTICLE IV.—*Of Creation and Providence.*—We believe that God is the creator, upholder and governor of all things; that He is above all His works and in them all; and that He made man in His own image, meet for fellowship with Him, free and able to choose between good and evil, and responsible to his Maker and Lord.

ARTICLE V.—*Of the Sin of Man.*—We believe that our first parents, being tempted, chose evil, and so fell away from God and came under the power of sin, the penalty of which is eternal death; and that, by reason of this disobedi-

ence, all men are born with a sinful nature, that we have broken God's law and that no man can be saved but by His grace.

ARTICLE VI.—*Of the Grace of God.*—We believe that God, out of His great love for the world, has given His only begotten Son to be the Saviour of sinners, and in the Gospel freely offers His all-sufficient salvation to all men. We believe also that God, in His own good pleasure, gave to His Son a people, an innumerable multitude, chosen in Christ unto holiness, service and salvation.

ARTICLE VII.—*Of the Lord Jesus Christ.*—We believe in and confess the Lord Jesus Christ, the only Mediator between God and man, who, being the Eternal Son of God, for us men and for our salvation became truly man, being conceived of the Holy Spirit and born of the Virgin Mary, yet without sin. Unto us He has revealed the Father, by His word and Spirit, making known the perfect will of God. For our redemption He fulfilled all righteousness, offered Himself a perfect sacrifice on the cross, satisfied Divine justice and made propitiation for the sins of the whole world. He rose from the dead and ascended into Heaven, where He ever intercedes for us. In the hearts of believers He abides forever as the indwelling Christ; above us and over us all He rules; wherefore, unto Him we render love, obedience and adoration as our Prophet, Priest and King.

ARTICLE VIII.—*Of the Holy Spirit.*—We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceeds from the Father and the Son, who moves upon the hearts of men to restrain them from evil and to incite them unto good, and whom the Father is ever willing to give unto all who ask Him. We believe that He has spoken by holy men of God in making known His truth to men for their salvation; that, through our exalted Saviour, He was sent forth in power to convict the world of sin, to enlighten men's minds in the knowledge of Christ, and to persuade and enable them to obey the call of the Gospel; and that He abides with the Church, dwelling in every believer as the spirit of truth, of power, of holiness, of comfort and of love.

ARTICLE IX.—*Of Regeneration.*—We believe in the necessity of regeneration, whereby we are made new creatures in Christ Jesus by the Spirit of God, who imparts spiritual life by the gracious and mysterious operation of His power, using as the ordinary means the truths of His word and the ordinances of divine appointment in ways agreeable to the nature of man.

ARTICLE X.—*Of Faith and Repentance.*—We believe that faith in Christ is a saving grace whereby we receive Him, trust in Him and rest upon Him alone for salvation as He is offered to us in the Gospel, and that this saving faith is always accompanied by reluctance, wherein we confess and forsake our sins with full purpose of and endeavor after a new obedience to God.

ARTICLE XI.—*Of Justification and Sonship.*—We believe that God, on the sole ground of the perfect obedience and sacrifice of Christ, pardons those who by faith receive Him as their Saviour and Lord, accepts them as righteous and bestows upon them the adoption of sons, with a right to all the privileges therein implied, including a conscious assurance of their sonship.

ARTICLE XII.—*Of Sanctification.*—We believe that those who are regenerated and justified grow in the likeness of Christ through fellowship with Him, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, the obedience to the truth; that a holy life is the fruit and evidence of saving faith; and that the believer's hope of continuance in such a life is in the preserving grace of God. And we believe that in this growth in grace Christians may attain that maturity and full assurance of faith whereby the love of God is made perfect in us.

ARTICLE XIII.—*Of Prayer.*—We believe that we are encouraged to draw near to God, our Heavenly Father, in the name of His Son, Jesus Christ, and on our own behalf and that of others to pour out our hearts humbly yet freely before Him, as becomes His beloved children, giving Him the honor and praise due His holy name, asking Him to

glorify Himself on earth as in heaven, confessing unto Him our sins and seeking of Him every gift needful for this life and for our everlasting salvation. We believe also that, inasmuch as all true prayer is prompted by His Spirit, He will in response thereto grant us every blessing according to His unsearchable wisdom and the riches of His grace in Jesus Christ.

ARTICLE XIV.—*Of the Law of God.*—We believe that the moral law of God, summarized in the Ten Commandments, testified to by the prophets and unfolded in the life and teachings of Jesus Christ, stands forever in truth and equity, and is not made void by faith, but on the contrary is established thereby. We believe that God requires of every man to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with God; and that only through this harmony with the will of God shall be fulfilled that brotherhood of man wherein the kingdom of God is to be made manifest.

ARTICLE XV.—*Of the Church.*—We acknowledge one holy Catholic Church, the innumerable company of saints of every age and nation, who being united by the Holy Spirit to Christ their Head are one body in Him and have communion with their Lord and with one another. Further, we receive it as the will of Christ that His Church on earth should exist as a visible and sacred brotherhood consisting of those who profess faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to Him, together with their children, and other baptized children, and organized for the confession of His name, for the public worship of God, for the administration of the sacraments, for the upbuilding of the saints, and for the universal propagation of the Gospel; and we acknowledge as a part, more or less pure, of this universal brotherhood, every particular Church throughout the world which professes this faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to Him as divine Lord and Saviour.

ARTICLE XVI.—*Of the Sacraments.*—We acknowledge two sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, which were

instituted by Christ, to be of perpetual obligation as signs and seals of the covenant ratified in His precious blood, as means of grace, by which, working in us, He doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and comfort our faith in Him, and as ordinances through the observance of which His Church is to confess her Lord and be visibly distinguished from the rest of the world.

(1) Baptism with water into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit is the sacrament by which are signified and sealed our union to Christ and participation in the blessings of the new covenant. The proper subjects of baptism are believers, and infants presented by their parents or guardians in the Christian faith. In the latter case the parents or guardians should train up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and should expect that their children will, by the operation of the Holy Spirit, receive the benefits which the sacrament is designed and fitted to convey. The Church is under the most solemn obligation to provide for their Christian instruction.

(2) The Lord's Supper is the sacrament of communion with Christ and with His people, in which bread and wine are given and received in thankful remembrance of Him and His sacrifice on the cross; and they who in faith receive the same do, after a spiritual manner, partake of the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ to their comfort, nourishment and growth in grace. All may be admitted to the Lord's Supper who make a credible profession of their faith in the Lord Jesus Christ and of obedience to His law.

ARTICLE XVII.—*Of the Ministry.*—We believe that Jesus Christ, as the Supreme Head of the Church, has appointed therein a ministry of the word and sacraments, and calls men to this ministry; that the Church, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, recognizes and chooses those whom He calls, and should thereupon duly ordain them to the work of the ministry.

ARTICLE XVIII.—*Of Church Order and Fellowship.*—

We believe that the Supreme and only Head of the Church is the Lord Jesus Christ; that its worship, teaching, discipline and government should be administered according to His will by persons chosen for their fitness and duly set apart to their office; and that although the visible Church may contain unworthy members and is liable to err; yet believers ought not lightly to separate themselves from its communion, but are to live in fellowship with their brethren, which fellowship is to be extended, as God gives opportunity, to all who in every place call upon the name of the Lord Jesus.

ARTICLE XIX.—*Of the Resurrection, the Last Judgment and the Future Life.*—We believe that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust, through the power of the Son of God, who shall come to judge the living and the dead; that the finally impenitent shall go away into eternal punishment and the righteous into life eternal.

ARTICLE XX.—*Of Christian Service and the Final Triumph.*—We believe that it is our duty as disciples and servants of Christ to further the extension of His kingdom, to do good unto all men, to maintain the public and private worship of God, to hallow the Lord's Day, to preserve the inviolability of marriage and the sanctity of the family, to uphold the just authority of the State, and so to live in all honesty, purity and charity that our lives shall testify of Christ. We joyfully receive the word of Christ, bidding His people go into all the world and make disciples of all nations, declaring unto them that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, and that He will have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth. We confidently believe that by His power and grace all His enemies shall finally be overcome, and the kingdoms of this world be made the kingdom of our God and of His Christ.

POLITY

The Joint Committee, after an examination of the forms of church government of the negotiating Churches and the practical working thereof, is greatly gratified to find:

1. That while the officers and courts of the negotiating Churches may bear different names, there is a substantial degree of similarity in the duties and functions of these officers and courts.

2. That, engaged in the same work, with the same object in view, and earnestly endeavoring to meet the conditions confronting the Churches in Canada, the negotiating Churches have been steadily approximating more nearly to each other, both in forms of church government and methods of administration.

3. That there are distinctive elements in each which would add to the efficiency of a united Church, and which can be preserved with great advantage in the form of polity to be adopted for The United Church.

4. That in this view it is possible to provide for substantial local freedom, and at the same time secure the benefits of a strong connexional tie and coöperative efficiency.

The following recommendations are submitted as setting forth the Polity proposed for the United Church of Canada.

I.—THE CHURCH

1. The members of The United Church shall be the members of the negotiating Churches, and such others as may hereafter become members.

2. The unit of organizations for The United Church shall be The Pastoral Charge. A pastoral charge may consist of more than one local church; a local church is a body of persons meeting for public worship in one place.

3. The governing bodies or courts of the Church, higher than those of the pastoral charge, shall be:

- (a) The Presbytery.
- (b) The Conference.
- (c) The General Council.

II.—THE PASTORAL CHARGE (CIRCUIT OR CONGREGATION)

A.—*Charges existing previous to the Union*

4. In the management of their local affairs the various churches, charges, circuits or congregations of the negotiating Churches shall be entitled to continue the organization and practices (including those practices relating to membership, church ordinances, Sunday schools and Young People's Societies) enjoyed by them at the time of the union, subject in general affairs to the legislation, principles and discipline of The United Church. Their representatives in the next higher governing body or court shall be chosen as at present.

5. The plan of organization prescribed for pastoral charges to be formed subsequent to the union may at any time be adopted by any church, charge, circuit or congregation existing at the time of the union.

6. Subject to the provisions of the next succeeding paragraph hereof, all property, real and personal, under the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada held in trust for or to the use of a church, charge, circuit or congregation of any of the negotiating Churches, shall be held by trustees appointed by or on behalf of such church, charge, circuit or congregation, upon trusts set forth and declared in a Model Trust Deed. This Model Trust Deed should be a schedule to the Act, and should contain, among others, a provision to the following effect: That the property is held for the church, charge, circuit or congregation as a part of The United Church, and that no property so held shall be sold, exchanged, or in any manner encumbered, unless the Presbytery shall, at the instance of the church, charge, circuit or congregation, have given its sanction, subject to an appeal, if desired, to the Conference.

7. Any property or funds owned by a church, charge, circuit or congregation at the time of the union solely for its own benefit, or vested in trustees for the sole benefit of such church, charge, circuit or congregation, and not for the de-

nomination of which the said church, charge, circuit or congregation formed a part, shall not be affected by the legislation giving effect to the union or by any legislation of The United Church without the consent of the church, charge, circuit or congregation for which such property is held in trust.

8. Churches, charges, circuits, or congregations received, subsequent to the union, into The United Church, with the approval of Presbyteries, shall be entitled, if they so desire, to the privileges of sections 4, 5 and 7.

B.—Charges to be formed subsequent to the Union

9. The liberty of the pastoral charge shall be recognized to the fullest extent compatible with:

(a) The oversight of the spiritual interests of the charge by the minister (or ministers) and a body of men specially chosen and set apart or ordained for that work, who shall jointly constitute the session;

(b) The efficient coöperation of the representatives of the various departments of the work of the charge by means of a meeting to be held at least quarterly;

(c) The hearty coöperation of the various pastoral charges in the general work of the Church, and

(d) The exercise by the higher governing bodies or courts of their powers and functions, hereinafter set forth.

10. New pastoral charges or local churches shall be formed with the consent of a Presbytery by persons residing within its bounds, who declare their adherence to the principles of The United Church, and their desire for the formation of such charge or church. Missions may be organized as pastoral charges by Presbytery of its own motion, or on the suggestion of the Missionary Superintendent or the Minister, under such regulations as the General Council may pass.

Before sanctioning the formation of a pastoral charge or local church, the Presbytery shall be required to hear and

consider the representations of any pastoral charge that may be affected by the proposed action.

11. (a) The members of the Church entitled to all church privileges are those who, on a profession of their faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to Him, have been received into full membership. The children of such persons and all baptized children are members of the Church, and it is their duty and privilege, when they reach the age of discretion, to enter into full membership. Admission to full membership, and granting of certificates of removal, shall be by the action of the session, and by the action of those in full membership where desired by the pastoral charge.

(b) The members of a local church who are entitled to vote at all meetings are persons in full membership, whose names are on the roll of the church. With the consent of these, adherents who contribute regularly to the support of the church may vote on temporal matters.

12. The members of a local church shall meet annually, and more frequently if they deem it advisable.

13. The Session shall have oversight of the spiritual interests of the pastoral charge. The management of its temporal and financial affairs shall be entrusted to a Committee of Stewards. The Official Board, consisting of the Session and Committee of Stewards, with representatives in full church membership of such other departments of church work as may be agreed upon by the General Council, shall meet quarterly, and more frequently if they deem it advisable, for the consideration of matters of joint interest.

14. The members of the session, other than the minister, shall be chosen by those in full church membership, and shall hold office under regulations to be passed by the General Council.

15. (a) It shall be the duty of the session to have the oversight of:

(1) The admission of persons into full membership, and the granting of certificates of removal.

(2) The conduct of members, with power to exercise discipline.

(3) The administration of the sacraments.

(4) The religious training of the young, and the organization of meetings for Christian fellowship, instruction and work.

(5) The order of public worship, including the service of praise and the use of the church edifice.

(6) The care of the poor, and the visiting of the sick.

(b) It shall also be its duty:

(7) To receive and judge petitions, etc., from members.

(8) To transmit petitions, appeals, etc., to Presbytery.

(9) To recommend suitable laymen to Presbyteries for license to preach.

(10) To recommend suitable candidates for the ministry.

16. The stewards shall be chosen by the local church, and, wherever practicable, should be persons in full membership.

It shall be the duty of the Committee of Stewards to secure contributions for the purposes of the local church, and to disburse the moneys received for these purposes.

17. It shall be the duty of the Official Board:

(1) To secure contributions for missionary and other general objects of the Church.

(2) To select representatives, in full church membership, of the pastoral charge to the Presbytery.

(3) To submit to the pastoral charge or local church for its consideration reports on life and work, including a full statement of receipts and expenditures, of indebtedness and of estimates for the ensuing year.

(4) To transmit from the pastoral charge, through the Presbytery, to the Settlement Committee, representations concerning the pastoral relation.

(5) To attend to matters affecting the pastoral charge not assigned to any of the other bodies.

18. All lands, premises and property acquired for the use of a local church or a pastoral charge of The United Church,

shall be held, used and administered under the trusts of the above Model Trust Deed. (See "Polity," par. 6.)

III.—THE PRESBYTERY

19. The Presbytery shall consist of:

(1) The ordained ministers within the bounds—

(a) Who are engaged in some department of church work; and

(b) Who have been placed on the roll by special enactment of the Conference in accordance with regulations to be made by the General Council.

(The rights to membership in Presbyteries, District Meetings, and Associations, enjoyed by ministers at the time of the union, shall be conserved.)

(2) The elders, deacons, leaders or other non-ministerial representatives of pastoral charges, within the bounds, equal in number to the number of ministers, and chosen in accordance with regulations to be made by the General Council.

20. It shall be the duty of the Presbytery:

(1) To have the oversight of the pastoral charges within its bounds, review their records, and form new pastoral charges, or local churches.

(2) To receive and dispose of petitions and appeals from the lower governing bodies or courts.

(3) To transmit petitions and appeals to the higher governing bodies or courts.

(4) To license as preachers laymen who are duly recommended and who after examinations are approved.

(5) To superintend the education of students looking forward to the ministry, and to certify them to theological colleges.

(6) To inquire, each year, into the personal character, doctrinal beliefs and general fitness of candidates for the ministry, recommended by sessions, official boards or local churches; and, when they have fulfilled the prescribed requirements, to license them to preach and to recommend them for the ordination of the Conference.

- (7) To induct or install ministers.
- (8) To deal with matters sent down by the higher governing bodies or courts.
- (9) To adopt measures for promoting the religious life of the pastoral charges within its bounds.
- (10) To select non-ministerial representatives to the Conference, of whom at least a majority shall have been previously chosen by pastoral charges to represent them in Presbyteries, and to nominate representatives on the Conference Settlement Committee.
- (11) To have the oversight of the conduct of ministers within its bounds.

IV.—THE CONFERENCE

21. The Conference shall consist of the ministers on the rolls of the Presbyteries within its bounds, and an equal number of non-ministerial representatives of pastoral charges chosen as provided for in subsection 20 (par. 10).

22. It shall be the duty of the Conference:

- (1) To meet every year.
- (2) To determine the number and boundaries of the Presbyteries within its bounds, have oversight of them, and review their records.
- (3) To receive and dispose of appeals and petitions, subject to the usual right of appeal.
- (4) To see that, as far as possible, every pastoral charge within its bounds shall have a pastorate without interruption, and that every effective minister shall have a pastoral charge, and to effect this through a Settlement Committee which it shall appoint annually.
- (5) To examine and ordain candidates for the ministry who have fulfilled the prescribed requirements and have been recommended by Presbyteries.
- (6) To receive ministers from other Churches subject to the regulations of the General Council.
- (7) To deal with matters referred to it by the General Council.

(8) To select an equal number of ministerial and non-ministerial representatives to the General Council.

(9) To have oversight of the religious life of the Church within its bounds, and to adopt such measures as may be judged necessary for its promotion.

V.—THE GENERAL COUNCIL

23. The General Council shall consist of an equal number of ministers and non-ministerial representatives chosen by the Conferences. Its regular meeting shall be held every second year. Its presiding officer shall be the chief executive officer of the Church, and during his term of office he may be relieved of his pastoral or other duties.

24. The General Council shall have full power:

(1) To determine the number and boundaries of the Conferences, have oversight of them, and review their records.

(2) (a) To legislate on matters respecting the doctrine, worship, membership and government of the Church, subject to the conditions: First, that before any rule or law relative to these matters can become a permanent law, it must receive the approval of a majority of the Presbyteries, and, if advisable, pastoral charges also; Second, that no terms of admission to full membership shall be described other than those laid down in the New Testament; and, Third, that the freedom of worship at present enjoyed in the negotiating Churches shall not be interfered with in The United Church.

(b) To legislate on all matters respecting property, subject to the limitations elsewhere provided in this Basis of Union, and subject also to the approval of the Conference in which the property is situated.

(3) To prescribe and regulate the course of study of candidates for the ministry and to regulate the admission of ministers from other Churches.

(4) To receive and dispose of petitions, memorials, etc.

(5) To dispose of appeals.

(6) To determine the missionary policy of the Church, and to provide for the conduct of its missions.

(7) To have charge of the colleges of the Church, and to take what measures are deemed advisable for the promotion of Christian education.

(8) To appoint committees or boards and officers for the different departments of church work, and to receive their reports and give them instructions and authority.

(9) To correspond with other Churches.

(10) And in general to enact such legislation and adopt such measures as may tend to promote true godliness, repress immorality, preserve the unity and well-being of the Church, and advance the kingdom of Christ throughout the world.

THE MINISTRY

I.—PASTORAL OFFICE, INCLUDING TERM OF SERVICE

Recognizing the desirability of preserving the essence of both the settled pastorate and the itinerary, the Joint Committee is of the opinion that a harmony of both principles is possible, and that the best features of both systems may be retained. We, therefore, recommend as follows:

1. The pastoral relation shall be without a time limit.
2. The policy of the Church shall be that every pastoral charge shall have, as far as possible, a pastorate without interruption, and that every effective minister shall have a pastoral charge.

3. There shall be for each Conference a Settlement Committee, consisting of ministers and laymen, and appointed annually by the Conference. On this Committee each Presbytery shall be represented. It shall be the duty of this Committee to consider all applications for settlement from ministers and pastoral charges within the district over which it has jurisdiction. For this purpose it shall meet annually before the meeting of the Conference next after that by which it was appointed.

4. A minister by his own action and a pastoral charge through its constitutional representatives may, by such a date before the annual meeting of the Settlement Committee as the General Council shall determine, seek a change of pastoral relation by means of an application through the Presbytery to the Settlement Committee. All such applications shall be in writing.

against:—

5. Any pastoral charge, in view of a vacancy, may extend a call or invitation to any properly qualified minister or ministers, but the right of appointment shall rest with the Settlement Committee, which shall report to the Conference for information only.

6. (a) When a pastoral charge about to become vacant at the end of the Conference year fails to give a call or invitation within the time specified by the General Council, the Settlement Committee shall make the appointment.

(b) When a pastoral charge becomes vacant during the Conference year through death or other emergency, the Presbytery concerned shall confer with the charge itself or with its constitutional representatives, and thereafter may arrange a supply for the remainder of the Conference year.

7. The Settlement Committee shall also have authority to initiate correspondence with ministers and pastoral charges with a view to completing arrangements to secure necessary and desirable settlements.

(a) Any minister shall have the right to appear before the Settlement Committee to represent his case in regard to his appointment; and any pastoral charge or Official Board may also appear by not more than two representatives, properly authorized in writing, appointed from among its members at a regular meeting, or at a special meeting of which proper notice has been given.

(b) When a minister chosen by a pastoral charge cannot be settled, the charge or its constitutional representatives may place other names before the Settlement Committee.

(c) While the right of appointment shall rest with the Settlement Committee, it shall comply as far as possible with the expressed wishes of ministers and pastoral charges.

8. There shall also be a committee for the transfer of ministers from one Conference to another, which may be composed of the presiding officer of the General Council of the Church, who shall be the convener and chairman of the committee, together with the presiding officers of the several Conferences. This committee shall have authority to transfer ministers and candidates for the ministry from one Conference to another, in harmony with the plan outlined in sections 3-7.

9. The minister in charge shall be the presiding officer of the Session and of the Official Board.

10. Every minister or candidate for the ministry, duly appointed regular pastor to a pastoral charge, shall have the right to conduct services in the church, churches or other places of worship in connection with said charge; and the right of occupancy of the manse or parsonage in connection with said charge, subject, however, to the rules and regulations of The United Church.

II.—TRAINING FOR THE MINISTRY

1. No candidate for the ministry shall be received unless he has been first recommended by a session, official board, or local church.

2. The duty of inquiry into the personal character, doctrinal beliefs, and general fitness of candidates for the ministry recommended by sessions, official boards or local churches, shall be laid upon the Presbytery and such inquiry shall be repeated each year until they are recommended to the Conference for ordination.

3. (1) The attainment of a B.A. degree including Greek, to be followed by three years in the study of Theology, is strongly recommended by the Church. Before ordination every candidate shall spend twelve months in preaching and pastoral work.

(2) In cases where the B.A. degree is unattainable, there shall be two alternative courses, both starting from University matriculation.

(a) Three years, at least, in Arts, followed by three years in Theology. Before ordination every candidate shall spend twelve months in preaching and pastoral work.

(b) Two years' preaching under the supervision of a Presbytery, with appropriate studies, and four years of a mixed Arts and Theological course in college.

4. *Suggested Curricula:*

(1) Course of study in Arts under (2) (a). English Language and Literature, three years. Two languages, one of which must be Greek, two years in each.

Philosophy, including Psychology, Logic and Ethics two years, Two other subjects from the Arts curriculum at the option of the student—one year in each.

(2) Courses of study under (2) (b):

(a) While under supervision of Presbytery, and engaged in preaching for two years:

English Bible; New Testament in Greek; Elements of Theology—Life of Christ; History of Missions; English Literature; Practical Training, including preparation of sermons.

(b) Four years of mixed Arts and Theological Courses in College.

The Arts Course.—English Language and Literature; Philosophy, including Psychology; Logic and Ethics; one language; any one option from the Arts Course.

Theological Courses.—Homiletics; Pastoral Theology; Systematic Theology; New Testament Languages and Literature; Old Testament Literature (English Bible); Church History; Christian Ethics and Sociology.

5. The following is suggested as a comprehensive course in Theology, from which may be selected subjects sufficient to constitute the three years' course in Theology as under 3 (1) and (2) (a):

Old Testament Language and Literature, including Textual Criticism. Exegesis, Biblical Theology, Introduction, Old Testament History and Old Testament Canon; New Testament Language and Literature, including Textual Criticism, Exegesis, Biblical Theology, Introduction, New Testament History and New Testament Canon; English Bible; Church History, including Symbolics; Systematic Theology; Apologetics, including Philosophy of Religion, History of Religion, and Comparative Religion; Christian Ethics and Sociology; Christian Missions; Practical Training, including preparation and delivery of sermons, preparation for and conduct of public worship, administration of the Sacraments, Church Law, the art of teaching and Sunday-school work, public speaking and voice training. Practical Training is to be understood to include not only instruction in these subjects but actual drill wherever the subject admits of it.

6. Provision shall be made in the Theological Colleges for instruction in the subjects of the above suggested course in Theology as far as practicable.

7. In every College special attention shall be given to Practical Training as specified and described above.

8. From the above (5) comprehensive course in Theology the Church shall prescribe certain subjects as compulsory, leaving others to the option of the students in consultation with the College authorities.

9. Candidates for the ministry who have entered on their course in Theology shall be allowed to complete it on the conditions which obtained when they began, but this privilege shall expire within three years from the date of the union.

10. The General Council shall possess the power of ordaining any person to the ministry if it sees fit so to do.

III.—THE RELATIONS OF A MINISTER TO THE DOCTRINES OF THE CHURCH

1. The duty of final inquiry into the personal character, doctrinal beliefs, and general fitness of candidates for the Ministry presenting themselves for ordination or for reception as ministers of The United Church, shall be laid upon the Conference.

2. These candidates shall be examined on the Statement of Doctrine of The United Church, and shall, before ordination, satisfy the examining body that they are in essential agreement therewith, and that as ministers of the Church they accept the statement as in substance agreeable to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures.

3. Further, in the ordination service before the Conference these candidates shall answer the following questions:

(1) Do you believe yourself to be a child of God, through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ?

(2) Do you believe yourself to be called of God to the office of the Christian ministry, and your chief motives to be zeal for the glory of God, love for the Lord Jesus Christ, and desire for the salvation of men?

(3) Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrines required for eternal salvation in our Lord Jesus Christ, and are you resolved out of the said Scriptures to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach nothing which is not agreeable thereto?

ADMINISTRATION

The Joint Committee, after careful consideration of the Missionary, Educational, and other connexional enterprises of the negotiating Churches, submits the following recommendations in relation thereto:

I.—MISSIONS

1. In the administration of the mission work of The United Church there shall be two departments: (a) Home,

including all the mission work within the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland and the Bermudas; (b) Foreign, including the missions already established or that may be established in other countries.

2. For the oversight and administration of these two departments there shall be two Boards to be known as the Board of Home Missions and the Board of Foreign Missions, to be elected in such a manner and endowed with such powers as the General Council may determine.

3. In recognition of the very valuable services rendered by the Woman's Missionary Societies, the union, constitution and lines of work of these societies shall be determined by the joint action of their Boards, subject to the approval of the General Council.

4. There shall be placed under the administration of the Home Mission Board of The United Church the moneys now administered under the caption of the Sustentation Fund, and Church and Parsonage Aid Fund of the Methodist Church; the Home Mission and Augmentation Funds, French Evangelization Fund, and Church and Manse Fund (except that under the Foreign Mission Board) of the Presbyterian Church; the Home Mission Fund of the Congregational Churches; and such portion of the Mission Fund now raised by the Methodist Church, and the Foreign Mission Board of the Presbyterian Church, as is now expended in Canada, Newfoundland and the Bermudas.

5. There shall be placed under the administration of the Foreign Mission Board of The United Church the Foreign Mission Fund of the Congregational Churches and that portion of the Mission Fund of the Methodist Church and of the Foreign Mission Fund of the Presbyterian Church now expended in other lands.

6. There shall be placed under the administration of the Board of Social Service and Evangelism and the Board of Sunday Schools and Young People's Societies of the United Church the funds now raised for the work of the Depart-

ments of Social Service and Evangelism and the Departments of Sunday Schools and Young People's Societies of the negotiating churches.

7. Inasmuch as certain expenses in connection with the various courts of the Church will have to be met, the ways and means of raising these funds shall be left to the General Council.

II.—PUBLISHING INTERESTS

It shall be left to the General Council of The United Church to determine how far the publications now issued by the negotiating Churches shall be amalgamated.¹

III.—COLLEGES

The Colleges at present connected with the negotiating Churches exist, each under its own charter, and in various relations to the respective Churches. These relations affect, first, the appointment of the Governing Board, second, the appointment of Professors in the Faculty of Theology; third, assistance or maintenance from funds controlled by the Church.

1. All the Colleges connected with the three negotiating

¹ The periodicals published by the Methodist Church are as follows: *Christian Guardian* (weekly), Toronto; *Epworth Era* (monthly), Toronto; *The Missionary Outlook* (monthly), Toronto; *The Wesleyan* (weekly, Halifax, and a Series of Sabbath School Illustrated Papers and Lesson Helps for Teachers and Scholars.

By the Presbyterian Church: *The Presbyterian Record* (monthly), Montreal, and a Series of Sabbath School Illustrated Papers and Lesson Helps for Teachers and Scholars.

The *Congregationalist*, a weekly paper, is published by the Publication Department of the Congregational Union of Canada.

The Methodist Church also possesses a printing plant, and carries on a general publishing business—"The Methodist Book Room," Toronto—the Eastern section of the Book Committee owning the property in Halifax in which the business is transacted.

The relation of the publishing interests of the Methodist and Presbyterian Churches to their respective Churches and the general methods of management are similar in each case, save that in the case of the Methodist Book concern, allocation of profits is made to the Superannuation Fund.

Churches shall, as far as possible, sustain the same relation to The United Church as, under their charter, they now sustain to the respective churches, until the General Council shall determine otherwise and necessary legislation shall give effect to changes made thereby.

2. The policy of the Church shall be the maintenance of a limited number of thoroughly equipped Colleges, due regard being paid to the needs of different parts of the country, and in furtherance of this policy amalgamation shall be effected as soon as possible in localities where two or more Colleges are doing the same class of work.

3. In addition to the Governing Boards of the several Colleges there shall be appointed by the General Council a Board of Education, which shall have such a general oversight of the Educational interests of the Church as the General Council may assign to it, and carry out such measures as may be decided in reference thereto.

4. There shall be a general Educational Fund, administered by the Board of Education, for the purpose of supplementing the revenues of the several colleges and assisting students in their preparation for the ministry, and for such other purposes and under such regulations as the General Council may from time to time determine.

5. The several educational institutions shall be encouraged to obtain permanent endowments for their maintenance, may receive contributions for this and other purposes at any time, and, upon receiving the consent of the Board of Education, may proceed to appeal for such funds.

IV.—BENEVOLENT FUNDS

Whereas there exist, in some form, in all the negotiating Churches funds to aid aged and retired ministers, and widows and orphans of ministers, provision for similar purposes shall be made in the constitution of The United Church by such amalgamation or modification of existing methods as may be found practicable; and such provision shall embrace the following particulars:

1. The rights of present and prospective claimants on existing funds in any of the negotiating churches shall be adequately protected. To this end:

(1) The present capital investments of the various benevolent funds of the negotiating Churches, and the income now contributed to those funds by publishing interests shall be combined into a "common trust," if practicable. The rights of present claimants and of prospective claimants (the latter being computed as of the date of the union) shall be a first charge on the revenue from this trust. If it be found that differences in the constitution and administration of the several funds are such as to necessitate separate trusts, instead of a common trust, this shall not be a bar to the carrying out of the general plan, because in that case their revenue shall be combined.

(2) The General Council of The United Church shall provide for (a) the assessing of each minister who is a member of any of the existing funds at the date of the union and of all ministers received into or ordained in The United Church after the union, on the basis of stipend or age, or both stipend and age, as the General Council may determine, and (b) the collecting of contributions, which shall be obligatory upon all local churches, based upon an equitable allocation or assessment under the rules to be formulated by the General Council, the minimum of such allocation or assessment being the amount which, together with the revenue from said trust or trusts and the foregoing assessment upon ministers, is requisite to make good the claims of claimants upon the Superannuation Fund to be instituted by the General Council.

2. Claimants on the proposed Fund shall include the following:

(a) All ministers who, at the time of the union, are beneficiaries of existing funds.

(b) All ministers who, at the time of the union, are regular contributors to existing funds on the scale provided by their respective denominations.

(c) All ministers' widows and orphans who are now, or may hereafter become, entitled to participate in the proposed Fund.

(d) All ministers, not members of or contributors to existing funds, who may signify their desire to become members of and contributors to the proposed Fund, on the basis of payments sanctioned by the General Council of The United Church.

Provision shall be made whereby ministers so applying may, by a certain scale of payments, be entitled to have their claim upon the proposed Fund date from the time of their reception into the ministry of any of the negotiating Churches instead of from the date of the union.

(e) All ministers received into or ordained in the Church after the union inasmuch as they shall be required at the time of their reception or ordination to become members of and contributors to the proposed Fund.

3. The sources of revenue of the proposed Fund shall be the following:

(a) Contributions of ministers who are members of said Fund at its inception, or afterwards become such, on a scale to be adopted by the General Council of the Church.

(b) Offerings in all local churches based upon an equitable allocation to be made by the Board of Management of said Fund, under regulations sanctioned by the General Council.

(c) Legacies and donations given for the purpose.

(d) Such grants from the profits of the publishing interests of the Church as may from time to time be determined under regulations to be framed by the General Council.

(e) Proceeds of any investments that may be made in the interests of the said Fund.

VI

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS

Evolution, Knowledge and Revelation. By Stewart A. McDowall, B.D., Trinity College, Cambridge, Chaplain and Senior Master at Winchester College. Pages 99. The Macmillan Co., 1924.

The contents of this suggestive little volume are clearly revealed in the heads of the chapters, Living and Thinking; Knowing and Loving; The Known and the Loved; Revelation and Reality.

The author himself states that his aim is to formulate a theory of knowledge which shall be consonant with the facts of biological science, and not neglect the spiritual interpretation of nature which is the essential characteristic not only of revealed religion but also of the best metaphysical systems.

The volume has an intensity of interest that is altogether out of proportion to its size. This is due partly to the underlying theme, namely, "A Theory of Knowledge." Ever since the days of Immanuel Kant the theory of knowledge has been the crux of both scientific thinking and religious experience. The very subject, therefore, commands attention. It would be a mistake, however, to attribute the principal interest of this stimulating little volume to a mere choice of subject. The author aims to set forth a theory of knowledge in accord with our passionate hunger for reality, satisfying modern personalism with all its personal and social demands. Any theory of reality that would meet modern needs must freely acknowledge the new scientific and democratic movements as related to the highest human values. It is in this emphasis that its real significance lies.

Its argument briefly stated is that logic and deliberating give us, through the rebound of inference, not only a sur-

face or inferior (reasoned) "knowledge," compared to the knowledge of reality which grows out of the interpretation that takes place between two personalities who become great friends. There are in fact two methods of knowledge, and only two, the one concerned with the physical environment and with concepts derived originally from themselves, called Logic, the other concerned with persons, called Love. We are constantly brought face to face with the problem of appearances and reality. In the one way of knowledge when we only emphasize Logic, the inferences of reason, we are led away from experience and fact just as soon as we formulate a concept concerning it and attempt to universalize it. The outcome of such thinking based on Logic and concepts is rationalism and skepticism. It is only as we maintain the immediate consciousness of phenomena in touch with our environment that we even have a fleeting sense of reality. In the other method of knowledge based on the living relation of all personalities we have in the very interpenetration of one in the other a sense of reality that is inherent in living itself. This knowledge is direct and immediate and its method is Love. Here again just as soon as we abstract the concept of love from the actual living we reduce it to abstract principles and ultimate skepticism. In the living consciousness of one personality of another we touch the depth of reality. This fact opens the way for an appreciation of the discovery of the ultimate reality of God in our personal relation with Jesus Christ.

The author relates this conception of reality with the process of evolution, on one hand, and revelation, on the other. He finds in environment a necessary immanent expression of the transcendent God. In this immanence of the living God in environment we have the gesture or offer that biologically becomes the basis of evolution and from the point of view of the human consciousness is the basis of the living revelation of God, which is made supreme and perfect at last in the personality of Jesus Christ. The

author does not draw the personal and social inferences that necessarily follow from such a viewpoint of reality. He adheres to his central purpose, namely, the description of a theory of knowledge consonant with the facts of biological science and not neglecting the spiritual interpretation of nature.

It seems that we here have Lotze's theory of knowledge raised from the level of Physics and Psychology to that of Biology as interpreted by Psychology and Sociology. It is a reaction from Hegel's absolute idealism, on the one hand, and the materialistic realism of Karl Marx on the other. It finds reality in the consciousness of immediate life-processes and makes place for a thorough-going personalism and also for a vital, growing socialism. It claims to furnish a basis of revelation in the evolutionary process. Hence the significant title, "Evolution, Knowledge and Revelation."

To say the least, this volume is very interesting and stimulating. The author in the preface and also in an appendix calls attention to a work published in 1916 by Giovanni Gentile, entitled "A Theory of Mind as Pure Act," and translated in 1922. He is concerned to state that he did not have access to it until his lectures were delivered and his copy prepared for the printer. He recommends it as a more technical discussion of a similar viewpoint, maintaining, however, that his own theory had been developed quite independently. As proof of his statement he appeals to several other prior publications of his own.

EDWARD S. BROMER

Religion in Russia under the Soviets. By Richard J. Cooke, one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Pages 311. The Abingdon Press, New York and Cincinnati, 1924.

"I have not attempted the impossible," the author states in the preface. "To give a brief epitome of the principal events in the Orthodox Church of Russia from the year

1917 to the present time," he frankly admits is exceedingly difficult. The sources of information, the control of all lines of communication, the corrupted art of diplomacy have all been involved in an epidemic of misrepresentation which make the real facts about Russia and particularly about religion under the Soviets most difficult to ascertain. After such a frank acknowledgment of the difficulties of the problem he first presents the historical background of the early history and development of the Orthodox Russian Church and thus attempts an epitome of the events concerning the Christian Church in Russia since 1917.

The main facts, after all, are not so difficult to find. The rapid rise and fall of the Kerensky government, the reconstruction of the Orthodox Church on the representative plan of government, the triumph of the Soviets, the complete separation of Church and State, the rise of the Living Church with its direct democratic form of organization, the counter-revolutionary attitude of the reconstructed Orthodox Church and its consequent persecution by the Soviet government, the release of Tichon, the arrested Patriarch of the Reconstructed Orthodox Church on his acknowledgment of the Soviet government, the cessation of persecution and the present struggle of Christianity and Atheism in the open field of free discussion—all these are historical facts which might well be set out more objectively than is done by the writer of this volume. Instead of an unbiased epitome of the facts we have a well defined interpretation. The assumption throughout is that the whole Russian Soviet movement is contrary to Christianity; that Communism and Atheism are one; that Christianity is identified with so-called representative democracy and its capitalistic national and international system. He calls upon Protestant Christians to support the Orthodox Russian Church. He fails to see the real issue of the modern industrial and agricultural revolution of which Russia is the center. Nowhere as in Russia to-day has Christianity been stripped so bare of its

ritualism, its sacramentalism, its angelology, its demonology, its priestcraft, its worship of relics and been made to face life in its direct personal and social relationships. Nowhere as in Russia are the bars, hard facts of personal and social human need of food, and drink, and clothing, and shelter so glaringly real. Nowhere as in Russia to-day is it necessary to see the simple fact of God, of Jesus Christ, the Kingdom of God as the brotherhood of man, as the simple essentials of the Christian religion. It is altogether natural that at the present time almost every ideal of progress is set over against a religious institution that was identified in ideal organization and administration with the autocratic Czarism that denied all freedom and progress in democracy and religion for the last four hundred years. The present volume contributes something toward a better understanding of the facts but it would be greatly strengthened, if it were less of an interpretation. What Americans need most of all is to know the facts themselves in order that they may see the real Russia. Whatever may be said against the Soviet government and the atheistic tendencies of some of its representatives certain facts remain clear. First of all, according to the constitution of the Russian Soviet government, Church and States are separated exactly on the same principle as in the constitution in the United States. In the second place, the entire secular educational system is put in the control of the government; and third, there is absolute freedom of discussion for or against religion. The assaults of atheism have ruthlessly laid bare the superficial and false elements incorporated in the Russian Orthodox Church. The persecutions to which the Church was subjected on the long run can only prove beneficial. The revolution both in politics, economics and religion has laid bare the primal issues of human life and development. Christianity has another new chance of interpreting God and man and the Kingdom of God.

Two recent articles, one in the *Century*, January 1925,

on "Russia's Challenge to Christianity," and another in the *Atlantic Monthly* of January 1925, "The Triumph of Atheism in Russia," are examples of the kind of statement of facts relative to Russia needed at the present time. The actual historical facts and the present tendencies in the religious life of the Russian people are exceedingly important not only for Americans to consider but for Christians throughout the world. It is always exceedingly unfortunate whenever we identify the welfare of Christianity with any particular form of government. A statement of our lamented Great War President, Mr. Wilson, is remarkably true, namely, "Society has not yet found the form of organization in which Christianity can most spontaneously live." Christians may well have open hearts and minds to the movings of God's spirit among the nations these days. The manifestations of His presence in Russia impress many thinkers as the dawn of a new day. The volume under review is valuable, however, for its avowed viewpoint. The inner development of the reconstructed Orthodox Russian Church is an important issue. The logic of the Old Protestant position naturally leads the present reactionary currents back into the Catholic stream. Under the pressure of a frontal attack of atheism and the threatened dissolution of middle class representative democracy, the present bulwark of organized religion, the position of the writer, even as a Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, becomes at least intelligible. It is distinctively reactionary. It corresponds with Fascism in politics. It is possibly the safest present expediency to follow. It will not, however, satisfy many progressive thinkers.

EDWARD S. BROMER

The Pastoral Office. An introduction to the work of the pastor by James Albert Beebe, Dean and Professor of Practical Theology, Boston University School of Theology. Pages 307. The Methodist Book Concern, New York and Cincinnati, 1923.

This volume was prepared at the request of the General Conference Commission on Courses of Study of the Meth-

odist Episcopal Church. "It aims to be an introductory survey of the whole task of the pastor, the first word, not the last, to young men on the threshold of the Christian ministry." A careful reading of the volume makes one feel that the author in a large measure fulfills his aim. As a book to be used in the conference course of study for the training of pastors in the Methodist Episcopal Church it will no doubt commend itself most favorably. Although it was written for the specific purpose and in the viewpoint and method of training ministers in the Methodist Episcopal Church, it transcends its denominational limitations and will appeal especially to young ministers of other churches as a helpful elementary interpretation of their great task.

Perhaps the main reason why it will commend itself so generally to pastors is its functional viewpoint of church organization and administration. This appears most clearly in Section II on Administration. The congregation is conceived of as an organism revealing its life in various functions such as worship, evangelism, religious education, service, and finance. This functional conception of the basis of organization is set in contrast with the general medley of organizations found in the average modern church. In the course of the development of Protestant congregations it seems that outside of worship sacraments and congregational discipline the impulse to organization came from outside. Such was the case in the Sunday School Movement, the Young People's Movement, Boys' Scout, Missionary Societies, etc. The result is that modern congregations have become organized, on the one hand, on the basis of a medley of activities thrust upon them, and on the other, on the basis of the several age-periods of individual development, involving a graded system. Multiplicity of organization, overlapping and confusion have been the result. It is refreshing to see such a fine analysis of organization by function as the author presents in Section II of this volume. He sees the congregation as a living organism. Its own

life in its various essential functions becomes the basis of organization which requires a corresponding spirit and method in administration.

Another reason why this volume will commend itself to young ministers of other denominations is the fact that the whole treatment is based upon the rediscovery of the Parish or the Christian Community as the center of activity. The tendency of Protestantism since the very beginning of the Sixteenth Century Reformation was toward individualism, on the one hand, and sectarianism, on the other, differentiating the Christian experience on the principle of freedom. To consider the congregation as a body of select believers of a given denominational type became the traditional way of viewing the local church. It was a confessional group of followers which became the object of pastoral care, to be maintained and nourished in worship, the preaching of the word, and the proper use of the sacraments. The vision of the parish and the community disappeared. The great work of preachers was to win individual adherents to their own confessional group and build them up in the faith. Protestant Christianity thus became divided and competitive in spirit and method whenever it thought of the community. The modern democratic movement especially as interpreted by the science of sociology has been forcing us to see the local community as a whole as the real field of service. From the point of view of the Protestant Church it means the rediscovery of the parish and the recognition of the Christianized community as the norm and goal of church activity. Although the author of this volume does not discuss this fact, it is nevertheless presupposed. It makes his treatment, especially of administration, fundamentally different from those of the past generation. It has the outlook of the new Protestantism which is coöperative and emphasizes the essentials of Christian experience, and concentrates itself to the work of the Kingdom of God always looking forward, beholding a vision of larger Christian unity.

A third reason why the book commends itself so generally is the fact that it is full of good common sense. It is not carried away with its vision and organizing principle to high flown theories of church organization and reconstruction but emphasizes the simple points of contact of inner Christian experience and outer activities. In the preface it is stated that "the writer has attempted to present a balanced statement of the entire work of the church and the methods to be employed, not in an exceptional but in an average community." It is this fact that makes the treatment so helpful to young ministers who are just entering their first parishes. It embodies a new vision with a corresponding principle of organization and administration but it aims to work on the basis of the simple elements of congregational life and recognizes the organizations now existing in the local church. It reveals the vital points of contact and shows the young minister how to begin to work toward the new goals.

The real unity of the treatment is found in Section II on Administration, pages 117-242. Here we have a full view of the task of the pastor in the local church and community. After discussing the principles and plans of organization the following organic functions are treated: (1) The Administration of Worship; (2) The Administration of Evangelism; (3) The Administration of Religious Education; (4) The Administration of Service—(a) The Church Family; (b) The Local Community; (c) The World Community; (5) The Administration of Finance.

It should be noted that under the Administration of Service (a) The Church Family, the idea of pastoral oversight is presupposed. The same may be true in (b) The Local Community. Under the conception of service it should be further stated that the Christianizing processes of the gospel are involved. It is apparent, therefore, that we have in this section a very comprehensive viewpoint of the congregation as an organization of church activity. It is

this section that reveals the real significance of the volume. It is here that the author maintains the real unity of his vision. But it is here also that a point of criticism might be offered. It seems a pity that we do not have each one of the five functions treated from the viewpoint of administration also fully worked out in separate sections in the same manner as is actually done in the treatment of Worship, Section II, pages 9-114, and in the treatment of Pastoral Relations, Section III, pages 245-307. No doubt the limitations imposed upon the writer by the General Conference of the Methodist Church required him to make a special emphasis of worship and of pastoral relations. It is apparent that he had in mind the division of the work of the ministry into two main sections, the minister as pastor and administrator, on the one hand, and the minister as preacher, on the other. It is the same division that the editors of the International Theological Library had in mind when they asked Dr. Washington Gladden to write a book on *The Christian Pastor and the Working Church*, and Dr. A. E. Garvie to write the companion volume on *The Christian Preacher*. Professor Beebe in his preface refers to his indebtedness to Dr. Gladden's remarkable volume. His own choice of title, *The Pastoral Office*, seems to indicate that he had in mind the same twofold division of the work of the ministry. It seems a pity, however, that the pastoral and preaching functions should be in separate treatments. The tendency toward a differentiated ministry in our larger university schools of theology is no doubt a good one. We need ministers as specialists,—as preacher, as teacher, as social worker, and a missionary. It nevertheless remains true that the regular Seminaries must prepare the all-around minister who is trained on fundamental principles to see the whole Christian community and develop his congregation in relation to other congregations of the community on a true functional basis. The number of congregations that can at present support two or more trained ministers

as specialists is very small. It is safe to say that nine tenths of all the ministers in the coming generation must be men of a thorough comprehensive training in all the functional elements of the minister's work. It seems that English and American writers on practical theology have always surrendered far too much to the individualism of the Protestant principle and treated practical theology in a more or less atomistic fashion. There is not a single complete treatise existing at present on practical theology by an English or American writer. We must turn to the German writers to find the treatment of practical theology as a whole. There is a great need in American Christianity at the present time for a comprehensive treatment of practical theology. It should be based on the conception that practical theology is the treatment of organized church activity at every point where the Christian experience of God breaks out in outward expression. The basic norm for such a treatment should be the Christian community. The writer of the volume under present consideration undoubtedly has developed a conception of the pastoral office that is determined by the vision of the Kingdom of God as the goal of all ecclesiastical activity. The very title of his volume, *The Pastoral Office*, however, indicates that the social, democratic element of his vision of the Kingdom does not fully determine his conception of local church organization. The democratic development of the local Christian community will increasingly demand a new treatment of practical theology as a whole. The emphasis will not be primarily only on the pastoral office, that is upon the minister, but upon the organized Christian community. Possibly the title of the new treatment will be "The Function of the Christian Congregation in Modern Life."

EDWARD S. BROMER

Life in Fellowship. By John P. Maud, D.D., Bishop of Kensington. Pp. 88. The Macmillan Company, 1924.

The question has been raised frequently in latter years, "How should the gospel be presented to the modern man?" It is a serious question. It involves the necessity of stating the abiding religious experiences of Christianity in modern categories of thought and life. And as far as the preacher is concerned, it presupposes his ability of finding the abiding religious experiences of the Bible embodied in the categories of an ancient apocalyptic view of God and the world and translating them into the personal and social categories of the modern scientific view of God and the world.

Dr. Maud has given us a fine illustration of this process. His little book is an answer to the question given above. He makes the statement, "God must become real to us, as one with whom life in intimate companionship is possible. How then is such an experience of reality in life to be won? In the hope of contributing something to this great end, we venture to make this appeal." His appeal was made during a mission conducted by the Church of England to the undergraduates of The University of Manchester. He had before him at least one type of the modern young man, the university student, trained in the scientific viewpoint of the world.

The themes in themselves reveal his approach. They are "The World's Desperate Need," "The One Sure Hope," "Life in Fellowship broken in Sin," "The Recovery of Life in Fellowship," "The Sickness of Society and the Power to be Whole," "Faith, the Victorious Principle," "The Joy of Sharing," "Life in Fellowship—its Source and Issue." It is a study of fellowship. It abounds in the personal and social thought-forms of modern life. It sees life as a problem of personality and personal and corporate relationships binding humanity as a whole, including all racial, national and international contacts. It is all summed up in the experience of God in Jesus Christ. "It is life in fellowship

with God our Father and His Son Jesus Christ; in the fellowship of His Spirit, it is life in fellowship one with another."

It is a book for preachers and adult study and discussion groups. It is suggestive and not exhaustive; constructive and not analytic. At the conclusion of each chapter there is a fine outlined basis for meditation and prayer, always concrete and practical.

EDWARD S. BROMER

Religion in the Thought of To-day. By Rev. Carl S. Patton. Pp. 159. The Macmillan Company, 1924.

The substance of a course of lectures given at Berkeley, California, on the Earl Foundation, in the winter of 1922 is here presented in this volume which aims to survey the several spheres of thought most significant for religion. The terms of the Earl Foundation require a subject that contributes to "the purposes of a high evangelism." The lecturer is an active minister of the Gospel. He writes as a general practitioner of medicine would write, as contrasted with the specialist, with comprehensive vision and practical motive. He believes that the reigning ideas of the period are "not a series of disconnected guesses in different realms but the product of an attitude and method that brings results similar and congenial in all fields and that these are, also, most favorable to the Christian religion."

He chooses Evolution, The Old Testament, The New Testament, Philosophy, and Theology, as topics of most vital interest to Christian people. They are discussed in as many chapters. The method of survey with a kind of running application is used.

The author shows evidence of wide and effective reading. It is evident that he writes as an avowed idealist, although he might insist that he is "a real-idealist," or "an ideal-realist," that is he makes place for the scientific viewpoint. It is his idealism that enables him rather easily to see the

great unities that bind the many varied expressions of the modern spirit. Evolution is discussed first but as a matter of fact the modern scientific viewpoint of God, man, and the world is the framework in which the treatment of all the other topics is built. The writer believes that the abiding religious experiences of Christianity may be expressed in the thought-forms of the modern scientific viewpoint. His idealism gives him a sense of unity. It seems, however, the unity of things is too readily apparent to the writer and his optimism too easy. Liberalism is usually too much inclined to see in the various phases of the modern movement tendencies "most favorable to the Christian religion," whereas the truth is that Christianity is being put to the severest test of its history, in this process of restatement in terms of the modern scientific viewpoint of the world, man and God. The balance of losses and gains should be more frankly faced. The chief value of the volume lies in the fact that it helps the busy pastors of our days to get an all-around intellectual view of the problem of maintaining the Christian experience of God and His Kingdom in the modern world.

EDWARD S. BROMER

The Historical Jesus. By Charles Piepenbring, Th.D. The Macmillan Company. Pages 224. Price \$2.25.

There is no scarcity of books dealing with the life and teachings of Jesus, and yet but few, if any of the many at hand satisfy the earnest student of the Gospels and the devout lover of Jesus. Each book seems to leave abundant room for a better one that is to follow.

The Historical Jesus by Piepenbring comes to the reader with many satisfying features, though of course not without shortcomings. The author succeeds in presenting Jesus with all the marks of an historic character and yet so extraordinary as to command one's devotion and reverence.

Piepenbring is a French Protestant preacher, for a number of years pastor of the Reformed Church of Strasburg.

He is a creditable scholar as well as a prominent preacher. He has written a number of books on biblical subjects, several of which have been translated into English.

The Historical Jesus has for its basis Professor Loisy's noteworthy commentary on the Gospels and presents in the main the views of this eminent French scholar concerning the historical Jesus as portrayed in the Gospel records. Piepenbring, however, finds Loisy deficient in his presentation of the nobler and more permanent side of the personality and teachings of Jesus. He aims in this book to make good this deficiency on the part of Loisy. And it is just this emphasis on the nobler and more permanent side of the personality and teachings of Jesus that gives his book its particular value. While it is based upon the commonly accepted conclusions of the advanced critical school on problems concerning the Gospels it nevertheless presents to us an historical Jesus far more worthy of the following and the worship which the church has persisted in giving Him than is the Jesus generally portrayed in critical accounts of His life and work.

Any one who wishes to see Jesus as He appears at His best to the modern historical scholar will find this book most valuable. Without being bothered with critical apparatus and wearisome "ifs" and "buts" the reader acquaints himself with the fruits of modern scholarship as it is represented by men like Loisy and Goguel in France, and Bousset, Holtzman, Keim, Weinel, J. Weiss, Wernle and their kind in Germany.

In a recent article in the English Expositor, Professor H. T. Andrews places *The Historic Jesus* by Piepenbring among the ten best books on the life of Jesus. This alone should commend the book to the serious consideration of readers of the REVIEW.

OSWIN S. FRANTZ

The Rise of Christianity. By Frederick Owen Norton. The University of Chicago Press. Pages 269. Price \$2.00.

The author of this book has rendered a distinct service especially to the lay searcher after the truth of the Christian religion as it may be gleaned from the sources dealing with Christianity's origin and early growth. In the brief compass of 250 pages he traces the rise and progress of the Christian religion up to the time when it was securely established in the Roman Empire. The facts which commend themselves to the modern student of the Christian literature of the first century as historical and trustworthy are presented in narrative form and in language that is clear and convincing. Detailed discussions of mooted questions are studiously avoided and yet many of these questions are carefully answered in the light of the conclusions of the best modern scholarship on these points.

We know no book of its size that sets forth as clearly as this one the main facts and interpretation of the Christian religion in its early stages. The book will interest the general reader and at the same time it readily adapts itself to the use of the student who wishes to make a more thorough study of the subject. References to the New Testament sources from which the facts are taken head each chapter, and references to a number of the best modern books on the subject under discussion are given at the close of the chapter to aid the student in his wider reading.

OSWIN S. FRANTZ

The Bible and Christian Science. By Allen W. Johnston. Revell. Pages 256. Price \$1.50.

The value of this book depends entirely upon the reader's accredited methods of proof. Any one who looks with favor upon the proof-text method of argument is sure to find Mr. Johnson's presentation of his case quite convincing. For there is in this book an excellent array of Scripture passages set over against a carefully selected list of readings

from "Science and Health and the Key," showing clearly the contrariety of ideas and facts expressed by the writings compared. If the passages cited in either case mean in their original context what the author interprets them to mean in their isolation, then the argument against Christian Science presented in this book is rather conclusive. However, one may well question whether the author does justice either to the Bible or to "The Key." Any student acquainted with the modern approach to the Bible is bound to take exception to the method of making the Bible bear its testimony solely through unrelated passages taken more or less at random from any part of it. We feel quite sure that the Christian Scientist will resent just as keenly the idea that the message of Science and Health and the Key is properly expressed in the passages cited. It is accordingly quite doubtful whether the reading of this book by a Christian Science advocate would lead to his conversion, a fond hope expressed by the author in his preface. But it will no doubt help to deepen the conviction of many who are already inclined to look with disfavor upon the teachings of Christian Science.

OSWIN S. FRANTZ

The Character of Paul. By Charles E. Jefferson. Macmillan. Pages 381. Price \$2.25.

Christianity is best measured, not by the number of its adherents, the geographical extent of its operations, the thoroughness of its organization, nor the accuracy of its theology, but by the character of its devotees. The real greatness of Jesus is not so much in what he did or said as in what he was. Varied and worthwhile as Paul's many contributions to Christianity were, his chief contribution was after all his character. Hence a study of Paul's character is of interest and value, not only because it acquaints us with a truly great man, but more particularly because it is a study of the Christian religion in one of its highest forms of expression.

All too long students of Paul contented themselves with writing about his theology, his labors as a missionary, and his efforts at Church organization. Books on the theology of Paul abound; articles on his missionary labors are not wanting; but careful and thorough studies on the character of Paul are far from common. Dr. Jefferson, therefore, meets a great need through his presentation to the reading public of his recent book on *The Character of Paul*.

The entire book of 381 pages is given to a delineation of the character of the "chief of the Apostles." The author examines him from every point of view possible. He treats his shortcomings and limitations quite as freely as his excellencies and superior gifts. The man Paul is put before us without expurgation and without inflation. We see a real man, but a man we are obliged to admire and love. After looking at him through the eyes of Dr. Jefferson we are inclined to agree with the author that "he is indeed Paul the Great," that "his name is above every name except the name of Jesus," that "he is the only man in the New Testament except Jesus, whom we would immediately enroll among the great." Only a work that is exceedingly well done can produce such a profound conviction on the part of its readers, and to produce it is a task well worth while.

There are but few men, if any, who are better qualified than Dr. Jefferson to write such a book. He has apparently made Paul the object of special study for many years. He claims that he has lived with him on intimate terms for thirteen years, and that he knows him better than any man who ever lived. This intimate acquaintance shows itself on well nigh every page of the book.

Then, too, his literary style adds to his qualifications as an author. Rarely does one find a book that is written in a style that is so clear, terse, and gripping. The author seldom uses an involved sentence. There is paragraph upon paragraph composed of nothing but simple sentences of

approximately a half dozen words each. Here is an example: "He was a great mind. His intellectual equipment was superb. He saw with extraordinary clearness. His breadth of vision was unprecedented. He also saw deeply. His eyes pierced to the center. He had insight into the soul of things." This clarity of thought and expression is characteristic of the entire book and commends itself to the reader.

Dr. Jefferson calls these chapters, twenty-six in number, sermons that were never preached. It is quite noticeable that both style and content fit them quite well for the pulpit. The fact that they were never preached is no doubt due to the fertility of the author's mind enabling him, as he says, to create more sermons than it is possible for him to preach. We surmise that with this book in the hands of a host of preachers, as it is bound to be, many of these sermons will find expression in some form or other in the pulpit. They certainly deserve pulpit proclamation.

Paul is sure to be a more intimate and helpful friend to many of us because we have read this book.

OSWIN S. FRANTZ